THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Dr. Howard Tillman Kuist, Professor of Biblical Theology for the Teaching of the English Bible, Princeton Theological Seminary, has published a popular study, abounding in quotation and illustration, of the subject of Scripture and the Christian Response—*These Words Upon Thy Heart.*[1] The volume consists of six lectures delivered early last year under the Sprunt Foundation. The title has been chosen to emphasize the power and worth of the Scriptures in forming Christian character.

The plan of the work is as follows. First it is shown how Scripture forms Christian character, through an examination of its appeal to the common man. Then is considered the way of response that Scripture requires, and it is suggested that for the understanding of Scripture the procedure recognized as basic in the study of the humanities should be employed. Finally, the endeavour is made to relate such procedure to man's freedom to think and to his motives for action. The plan is vaguely stated, but let us examine its most characteristic feature, which embodies a parallel between the study of the humanities and that of Scripture.

In Ruskin's 'Essay on Composition' there are defined and illustrated nine of the most common ways in which parts may be arranged to form a given whole. They are entitled respectively: Principality, Repetition, Continuity, Curvature, Radiation, Contrast, Interchange, Consistency, Harmony. Upon the first six, as those most commonly used, Professor Kuist concentrates. His aim is to show that the laws by which the eye is guided to recognize essential qualities in other mediums of expression are also to be seen in Scripture.

'Good composition is the product of appropriate symbols in an articulate arrangement. Thus, a musician composes an air by putting notes (sounds) together in certain relations; a painter composes a picture by combining colours, hues, lines, shapes, in pleasing relations; and an author composes a piece of literature by arranging words (terms) in sequence (syntax) which conveys meaning. So Holy Scripture took shape as a vehicle of communication, to make its divine truth intelligible.'

The Law of Principality is a law of arrangement in which one feature is made more prominent through the subordination of others to it. This is found to be so in good pictures and good musical composition; and it is also true of the Parables of Jesus, in which one must determine which single feature is essential, and which details are to be regarded as drapery.

The Law of Repetition is a law of arrangement in which certain parts imitate or repeat each other. If nothing is repeated, whether a figure in a painting, a tone in music, or a phrase in literature, chaos rather than unity is likely to be the result. That repetition plays a prominent part in Biblical composition appears from the parallelisms of the Psalter, the 'Ye have heard . . . but I say' of the 'Sermon on the Mount,' and the solemn refrain of Revelation, 'He that hath an ear, let him hear.'

The Law of Continuity is a law of arrangement in which a certain orderly succession is given to a number of objects more or less similar. The receding pillars of a cathedral aisle in perspective supply an instance. So also does the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, in which a whole succession of Old Testament characters are linked together 'by faith.'

The Law of Curvature is a law of arrangement in which continuities of object, mass, or colour are if possible in curves rather than straight lines or angular ones. We find it in music in the principle of crescendo and diminuendo, in literature in the use of climax. In the New Testament St. Luke is the great master of climax; his account of Jesus' visit to the synagogue of Nazareth is arranged about two cycles of cause and effect.

[1] John Knox Press, Richmond, Virginia; $2.50.

The Law of Radiation is a law of arrangement in which lines are connected through their all springing from one point, or closing towards it. Ruskin cites here the boughs of a tree. In the New Testament this law is applied to the art of living where Jesus says, 'I am the vine, ye are the branches,' or where St. Paul says, 'Ye are the body of Christ.'

The Law of Contrast is a law of arrangement or composition in which through comparison and contrast differences are revealed which might not otherwise be obvious. This law is found in all the arts. Speaking of Turner, Ruskin says that 'his suns never set behind dark mountains without a film of cloud above the mountain's edge.' In Biblical composition contrast is effectively used. In the Sermon on the Mount we meet with contrast in imagery: light and darkness, white and black, and the two houses. True and false practices are set over against each other as related to giving, praying, and fasting. And parables like the Prodigal Son, the Good Samaritan, and the Four Soils are based on the law of contrast.

Thus, as Professor KUIST tries to show, sharpened senses and the power to understand are intimately connected, be the power to understand viewed in terms of æsthetic response, or scientific inquiry, or the fulfilment of moral relations. 'The laws of composition provide an objective guide to exact observation.' 'By recognizing these laws of composition in Biblical passages which are familiar and appealing, and thus finding the sources of their power, the student educates his eye to trace the more disguised patterns in a strange or unfamiliar medium.'

The Rev. D. R. DAVIES has written a book on *The Sin of our Age*.[1] The theme of his argument is not just the defect, or the error, or even the falsity of our civilization, but its *sin*, which implies an element of responsibility and guilt. It also involves a specific interpretation of modern history. It assumes that the final causes of the crises and disasters of our era are to be sought in the realm of the relation between man and God. It lifts the whole discussion of our civilization from the level of sociology to that of theology. Any proposed solution inevitably develops into terms of repentance. It is indeed only on the level of theology that any talk of repentance becomes rational and intelligible, and, further, anything less than repentance is meaningless.

[1] Geoffrey Bles; 6s. net.

Mr. DAVIES begins by describing the civilization about which he is writing. It is, he says, first universal. All civilizations in the past have been local, like the Roman Empire. Hence the distinction of one civilization did not carry fatal possibilities for all humanity. Western civilization is supreme, dominant, and universal. No people can live outside its sphere. The world holds no refuge for those who may want to escape from the toils and penalties of Western society. While other civilizations still maintain themselves, they do so only within the orbit of Western civilization and on its sufferance. Thus the world to-day is one community.

The second feature of our civilization is the progressive substitution of human energy by solar energy, and now by atomic energy, which ushers in a cosmic revolution, as the dominant labour or productive power. Mr. DAVIES is referring to the vast technological revolution of our time, by which man is ceasing to be the chief source of productive energy, and has invested matter with a new value which is proving deadly to the spirit of man.

The third feature of Western civilization is the domination of culture by science, to which we owe the vast technical mastery of the modern world. This is the profoundly significant *cultural* differentiation of our civilization from any other. Our civilization has transferred science, which is a method of investigation, into a philosophy, a dogmatic, material affirmation about the nature of reality. The assumption that Reality is identical with what science perceives issues into the 'dreadful position': that *ultimate, final Reality is subordinate to man.* And this destroys every single bastion defending the dignity and liberty of the individual.

This analysis prepares the reader for the next step in the argument which deals with the root sin of Western civilization, which is the enthronement of man at the centre of life, being and thought. This did not happen just at once. It has taken centuries to ripen into maturity. Nobody would have described the new tendencies in art, literature and politics that emerged in the Renaissance as tendencies towards the centralizing of man to the exclusion of God. But that is what they were. In their beginnings these tendencies seemed innocuous. They even appeared to be good and praiseworthy. We may be sure that the Montaignes, the Mirandellos and the Van Ulrichs never suspected that out of the heady, exciting, and thrilling things they were saying about man and

his emancipated powers would come at long last the soulless Deism of the eighteenth century and the Positivism of the nineteenth in which the worship of humanity has become self-conscious. Still less did they dream that they were initiating ideas and values whose final poison-fruit would be borne in Marxism and Nazism.

A further result of this long development has been the abolition of other-worldliness. Formerly man was daily conscious of being a denizen of two worlds. His successor, modern man, is conscious of only one world. By deifying humanity and giving it the quality of an absolute, modern man narrows existence down to this present world. Belief in a world-order beyond death is completely absent from the hopes and activities and enjoyments of the secularized man of to-day. The extent of this general decline of belief in another world may be gauged from the fact of its comparative subordination in the teaching of the Church and in the thinking of Church members. Dr. Welch, the former Director of Religious Broadcasting, said at a Conference at Cambridge that of six thousand talks and sermons it had been his duty to read, only one had said anything vital about life after death.

Theoretical appreciation of belief in another world is, of course, stronger in the Church than in the world. But it is not by any means a dynamic disturbance in the life of the believer. What practical influence does it exercise upon the concrete pursuits of daily existence? How far does it affect the attitude of parents in their care for their children and training of them? A true answer to these questions would demonstrate the extreme secularization of modern man's consciousness. This is, of course, due to the rejection of the Christian doctrine of man. Man's existence, in the mind of the man of to-day, has shrunk to a completely one-dimension level.

But there is a further result. The gradual emergence of man into a position of cosmic centrality has led to the abandonment of a transcendent order beyond time, and this, in turn, has led to the dissolution of spirit. In this phrase, Mr. DAVIES describes the working of philosophical materialism to which man is a mere biological organization of atoms and a biological organization of social relations. Matter is the only objective reality. There is no mystery left in the world. Science has destroyed many things that were 'mysterious,' psychology is in process of destroying more and spiritualism adds the final touch. In the result mind has no distinctive identity of its own. It is a by-product. Thought, art, philosophy, religion are finally reducible to the manner in which material atoms are combined together in a single organism.

In one particular combination these atoms throw off self-consciousness with its expressions, such as Hamlet, a Beethoven symphony, a Rembrandt portrait, a York Minster. And it becomes possible to analyse spirit into specific chemical elements. This is the hub of the materialist theory. And Mr. DAVIES gives a brief summary of the way in which it has developed. Modern Europe began by elevating man into the centre of being. This issues gradually into obsession with this present world. Concentration on this world leads to the absorption of spirit into matter. And this process in the end has produced a new type of man, what Mr. Wells calls 'a lonely-spirited ape,' whose whole being is in this world and to whom there is no mystery in life or death.

What then has Mr. DAVIES to say to all this? In his last chapter, which is headed 'The Recovery of Christian Belief,' he emphasizes some important points. One in particular is not only vitally important in itself but has a particular relevance to our 'present discontents.' It is the fact that every social and ethical system is rooted in a faith and that therefore you cannot erect a Christian civilization on a basis of secular belief. It is a Christian civilization in essentials that the Western world is seeking to establish, and for this nothing will suffice, nothing enduring, except a Christian belief.

Mr. DAVIES deals with this at some length. The first step, he says, to a recovery of belief is to see the relevance of Christianity to our present situation. The world is in a bad state. Diplomacy will not cure its evils. Statesmanship is exhibiting failure on a large scale. We must see that man needs redemption above all things and this no secular theory will supply. We are suffering the results of the secularizing of life and thought, in which process man has displaced God and the world has come to look for its blessings to the activities of man-made systems. We are seeing before our eyes the tragic failure of all such theories and efforts. Not until God has His place in the thought and belief and surrender of man will the world be redeemed.

The Context of the Gospel Story.

By the Reverend Roderic Dunkerley, B.D., Ph.D., Hockley, Essex.

It has often been remarked that it is in the moments of deepest emotion that a man reveals his fundamental convictions. If we approach the Gospels with this in mind we quickly come upon the fact that on at least three of the occasions when Jesus was evidently most deeply moved He expressed acute disappointment and a strong sense of frustration.[1] To ignore this undeniable fact, as scholars have so often done, is to lose a vital clue to the meaning of the whole story and to the significance of His life and death. On the other hand, starting from it and working out its implications we find that quite an astonishing amount of the narrative material of the Gospels falls coherently into shape around it and a strong presumption arises that we have here the essential elements of an historical life of Jesus.

That this is directly contrary to certain traditional conceptions of the life does not mean that the evidence and argument can be lightly set aside; the time may have come for a reconsideration of these matters and for a new reconstruction of the historical basis of our faith. That it is also opposed to the findings of the modern school of Form-Criticism does not necessarily mean that it is wrong; those findings may be, and I believe are, ill-based and unproven.

Having argued this position in two recent articles in this magazine,[2] I propose now to call attention to certain other evidence—external to the Gospels—which supports my thesis. Recalling the 'major and minor coherents' enumerated in my last paper we may perhaps call these facts 'external coherents.' Like the other facts mentioned they fit into the picture logically and coherently, and seem to belong to it in rather a remarkable manner. Or to change the figure, they provide a fitting frame for the picture and the right context for the story.

Before studying them, however, there is one point which I wish to make clear. There seems to be an odd assumption in some quarters that if one stresses these aspects of the life of Jesus one is denying its Divine content and reducing Him to the level of a merely human teacher and a prophet whose plans went awry. I resent that suggestion. To deny that the issue was a foregone conclusion to Him from the first, and even to deny that it was in fact a foregone conclusion, is not to leave God out of account. I believe that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself; I believe that the advent of Jesus was the Act of God and that He was the Word of God; I believe that in Him God offered the Jews the unsearchable riches of His Kingdom, not for themselves alone but that they might be His ambassadors to mankind; I believe that they could and should have accepted this offer, and that the whole course of history might have been different; I believe that the Cross is the enduring symbol of the sin that rejects God's love and frustrates His purposes, and of the love that bears this sin and will not take man's No for final answer.

However such a view of the Life of Jesus may be characterized it cannot justly be called humanist. It emphasizes rather the Divine Initiative and the Divine Sacrifice. In its stress upon the imminence of the Kingdom it is akin to the eschatological interpretation, but in its insistence that this could only come about through the repentance and moral response of the people it is more realistic as well as closer to the evidence of the Gospels. Perhaps the phrase 'moral eschatology' describes it less inadequately than any other. It involves a challenging message of God's purpose for humanity *now* which 'realized eschatology' sadly lacks.

I.

Our first 'external coherents' are facts which suggest that Christ's coming took place at a divinely appropriate moment in history if a widespread religious movement was to ensue. They confirm the words of Jesus at the opening of His campaign: 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the good news,'[3] and Paul's parallel statement, 'When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son.'[4]

We may begin with—

(1) *The Messianic Hope of Israel.* The Hebrew prophets were of course in the first instance preachers of righteousness to their own times. 'Nevertheless, it remains true that inspired prophecy ever points to a future time when the great principles which it had discerned to be at work in Israel's history would be openly manifested and developed. From first to last the prophets of the Old Testament look and wait for a Kingdom of God; they depict its nature and conditions in varied and many-sided imagery; they point with ever-increasing clearness to a personal Being in

[1] Mt 11^{20-24} 23^{37-39}, Lk 19^{41-44}.

[2] July 1946, February and March 1947.

[3] Mk 1^{15}. [4] Gal 4^{4}.

whom and by whom all the types, figures, and anticipations of the old dispensation will be brought to fulfilment.'[1] No one reading these books without knowledge of Jesus and what befell would come to the conclusion that when God's vicegerent came to inaugurate this blessed era He would die a shameful death and the Golden Age be indefinitely postponed. Something very different—admirably summed up in the Bethlehem song of peace and goodwill—was anticipated, and if we believe in the inspiration of the prophets was purposed and promised by God. It is strange how scholars have often allowed their theological presuppositions to obscure this fact.

We come next to—

(2) *Similar Anticipations beyond Israel.* It is a remarkable fact that something akin to this Jewish expectation is found elsewhere. In the Avesta there is the promise of a son to be born to Zarathustra at the end of time. 'He shall come forth from the region of the dawn. . . . When he comes to earth he will free the world from decay and death. Then men shall be raised from the dead, the Spirit of Evil shall be finally overcome and destroyed, and everlasting happiness shall reign over a renovated world.'[2] After passing in review a number of other such anticipations, Dr. A. S. Palmer said, 'In all these heathen gropings after truth we observe the same idea coming into prominence, of a great life-giving deliverer returning to earth and inaugurating a new and golden era as the dawn of a better day.'[3] Much research and discussion have been going on regarding the influence of Iranian thought on Hebrew religion including the apocalyptic literature and so possibly on Jesus Himself and Paul,[4] but this does not materially affect my thesis. The realistic question is not what borrowings of idea or imagery took place but whether these gropings were Divinely prompted. Was it in the Divine ordering that such a hope should grow and persist, and if so, is it unreasonable to suggest that it did so in order to prepare the minds of men for the advent of Christ?

Coming closer to the times of Jesus, we find in Vergil a vivid sense of the approach of a new age —a Golden Age of justice and peace. His famous Fourth Eclogue (40 B.C.) was interpreted by Dante, and by many before and after him, as a prophecy of the coming of Christ, and while we to-day consider rather that he was writing of the anticipated birth of a child of his own day, probably the son for whom Augustine hoped in vain, he certainly cherished what we may properly call Messianic hopes. 'It can hardly be denied that in both the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* we continually meet with a conception which in many ways is parallel to the Jewish expectation of a Messiah; that is to say, the conception of a national hero and ruler, divinely inspired, and sent to deliver not his own nation only but mankind, raising them to a new and ethically higher existence.'[5] We may just notice also the significant statement of Suetonius —'A firm persuasion had long prevailed through all the East that it was fated for the empire of the world at that time to devolve on some who should go forth from Judaea,'[6] and Tacitus says much the same.[7]

We observe next—

(3) *The Favourable Conditions which existed in the First Century.* In view of these hopes in Israel and beyond, it is a striking fact that the Mediterranean world had been brought into a unity as though in preparation for a widespread realization of them. The establishment of the Roman Empire at this particular moment in history looks strangely like a providential occurrence. It held immense potentialities of good for mankind. For the first time, something like a stable order existed. 'Free communication between different parts of the world was made possible by the new roads, the new postal system, and the complete suppression of war by land and of piracy by sea.'[8] The widespread use of Greek as a common language may also be mentioned, and too the existence of companies of Jews with their synagogues and scriptures in most cities of the Empire. While, of course, these various factors assisted the expansion of Christianity which did actually take place, they accord far better with the thought of the fuller and more majestic expectation which I have argued was held by Jesus Himself.

There was, however, one great obstacle in the way of all this—

(4) *The Political Tension in Palestine.* Relations between the Jews and Romans were tense and strained; revolt had broken out in A.D. 6 against Judas of Galilee, and was again to boil up under Caligula. Trouble was constantly brewing, and minor clashes took place (Lk 13^{1}). It was becoming highly probable that a final eruption would soon come and an end be put for ever to the national existence of the Jews, and so to the possibility of a national missionary campaign to enlighten the Gentiles and establish God's Kingdom on earth—the work for which they had been chosen and called (Is 60) and to which, as I believe, Jesus came to summon them (Mt 5^{13-16}, etc.). One thing only could have prevented this catastrophe

[1] R. L. Ottley, *The Hebrew Prophets*, 106.
[2] *The Hibbert Journal*, v. [Oct. 1906], 157.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 165.
[4] W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah*, App. D.
[5] *The Hibbert Journal*, v. [January 1907], 310.
[6] *Vesp.*, 4. [7] *Hist.*, v. 13.
[8] *The Hibbert Journal, ib.*, 323.

—a radical change of mind on the part of the people and their religious leaders. And Jesus came at the psychological moment, while yet there was time, calling for this. Had they listened and obeyed they would have adopted an entirely new and godly attitude to their foes (Mt 5^{38-48}, etc.), renounced all desire for military victory (Mt 4^{8-10}), and shared the hope of Jesus for the gathering of all nations into unity and peace. Jerusalem would have become 'an impregnable base for a mission of God's truth to the world . . . a centre of missionary light which the scattered and ill-educated Church of the first Christian centuries sadly lacked.' [1]

II.

We will consider next certain facts regarding Early Christian thought and life. And in the first place, there is—

(5) *The Principle of Contingent Prophecy.* Whatever the influence upon Jesus and His first followers of the apocalyptic literature with its arbitrary and deterministic ideas, there should be no doubt that their true spiritual ancestry is to be found in the Old Testament prophets. Now, it is a familiar fact of Old Testament study that the most spiritually minded of the prophets recognized that their anticipations of the future whether for good or ill were not fixed and irrevocable but conditional on the reaction of their hearers and others. The classic passages are Jer 18^{7-10} 26^{12-19}, and the Book of Jonah illustrates the point perfectly. Jerome's statement may be quoted—'Many of the prophecies were given, not that they should, but that they should not be fulfilled,' [2] and Farrar's —'Their menace always implied an *unless*.' How is it that scholars have so often missed the implications of this fact for New Testament study? Surely we would have expected Jesus, inheriting this conception of prophecy, to have promised the Kingdom if, and only if, men turned from their sin and became willing for God's will, and this is exactly what we do find. He proclaimed that the Kingdom was at hand and called on men to repent. To suggest that this does not mean that they were to repent *in order that it might come* is to imply that He broke away from the prophetic heritage which we know was so dear to Him in favour of the much poorer and less spiritual deterministic conceptions of the apocalyptists, and the burden of proof is on those who take this extraordinary position.

Similarly as regards the Early Church. If Jesus thought and spoke as I have indicated, we would naturally expect to find parallel apostolic preaching and we do so in the words attributed to Peter—'Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, *that so there may come* seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and that he may send the Christ . . .' (Ac $3^{19, 20}$). That the purity of this thought should often have been lost and that the popular apocalyptic ideas should have gained influence is not surprising. Hence the strong belief of the Early Church in the approaching end of the age; this has always been an embarrassment to those who have held the slow evolutionary conception of the coming of the Kingdom (emphasizing the Parable of the Leaven, etc.), but it must be accounted for, and can be in the way I suggest without admitting that Jesus was a thoroughgoing eschatologist.

Our next point is the apostolic thought of—

(6) *The Cross as a Crime.* There is, of course, no doubt that it is often spoken of as foreordained and foretold, but it is important to notice that there is another quite definite line of thought which if logically worked out would contradict that teaching. It is found most strikingly in Stephen's speech where the Jews are bluntly called 'murderers' (Ac 7^{52}) and the death of Jesus is regarded as the culminating act in an age-long resistance to the Divine will, but other passages also suggest it (Ac 3^{13-15} 5^{28-30}). And Paul similarly says that the Jews 'both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drave out us, and please not God' (1 Th 2^{15}) and that the rulers of this world knew not the wisdom of God, 'for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory' (1 Co 2^{8}). It has often been remarked that Stephen's speech is like an elaboration of the Parable of the Unfaithful Husbandmen (Mk 12^{1-8})—Christ's own manifesto regarding the meaning of His death. In view of all this the modern tendency to emphasize the deterministic thought of the New Testament as of supreme importance seems lacking in insight. Both conceptions were undoubtedly current in the Early Church, the contradiction between them being left unresolved, and we have no right to ignore the fact that the Cross was sometimes regarded as the sinful frustration of the Divine intention.

We note next—

(7) *The Changed Leadership of the Early Church.* The first group of disciples—the Twelve—apparently proved inadequate for the new situation created by the apostasy of the Jews and others had to be raised up to share in the leadership of the Church. It is possible, of course, that a more extensive and successful campaign eastwards took place than we have knowledge of; there are some traditions to this effect linked with the names of

[1] L. Dougall and C. W. Emmet, *The Lord of Thought*, 121, 146.
[2] *H.D.B.*, iv. 126.

Thomas, Bartholomew, and others. But it must be deemed strange that so many of those first called and commissioned should drop entirely out of the picture, and that others should fill so large a place in it—Stephen, Philip, Barnabas, James the Lord's brother, and especially Paul. It is surely remarkable that in the 'Acts' Peter is the only one of the Twelve to have any considerable place in the story. The appointment of the Twelve was the great counterstroke of Jesus to the opposition of the scribes—in other words His adaptation to a developing situation—and here we have a further example of such wise adaptation, and further evidence that a real struggle was taking place the issue of which was not a foregone conclusion.

(8) *Progress and Prospects in the First Century.* There is some rather astonishing proof of the successful propagation of the Gospel in the first hundred years after the Crucifixion, which raises some strange questions as to what might have been if the Jews had responded instead of rejecting Jesus and had gone forth under His leadership to the spiritual conquest of the world. We read of 'the vast multitude who suffered'[1] under Nero, and that in Bithynia in A.D. 110 there were so many Christians that the temples were almost abandoned.[2] At Rome several people of high rank became Christians; as early as A.D. 57, Pomponia Graecina, wife of Aulus Plautius, who commanded the Roman army in Britain, was accused of 'foreign superstition'; a little later, Flavius Clemens, cousin of the Emperor Domitian, and his wife, Flavia Domitilla, were similarly accused, he being put to death and she banished. Antiquarian discoveries make it almost certain that the 'superstition' was Christianity.[3] Now, the sons of Clemens had been designated by Domitian as his successors, and it is possible therefore that the Church just missed capturing the throne of the Cæsars two hundred years before Constantine. We read of 'saints in Cæsar's household,'[4] but a saint on Cæsar's throne might have placed his sceptre at the Master's feet and worked with Him for the redemption of mankind.

III.

Our last two points are concerned with what followed the Jews' rejection of Jesus; it is difficult not to think that they resulted from it.

(9) *The Destruction of Jerusalem.* We have seen the ominous state of affairs in Palestine when Jesus started to preach (4), and that He called the nation while yet there was time to repent and so to avoid the threatening clash with Rome as a prelude to the world mission of the Kingdom of God. There is much evidence in the Gospels that He foresaw the results of their refusal and warned them of coming disaster. To call such passages *vaticinia post eventum* is perverse; if He had insight into God's will, why should He lack foresight regarding the results of flouting it? The catastrophe of A.D. 70, involving the lasting disintegration of the Jewish nation, was a complete vindication of His action in summoning them to be reconciled to God, to each other, and to their enemies. If there is any providence governing men and nations, here is signal proof that at the crucial moment of their history they missed their appointed destiny.

(10) *The Tragic Story of Christendom.* It is not easy to pass in review the long history of the Christian Church without feeling that something went sadly wrong somewhere. We may rejoice in all the victories of grace, in individual lives and in social affairs, and yet feel that the contrast between the angels' song at Bethlehem and the 'two thousand years of wrong' which ensued is very sharp. The old Victorian complacency about the idea of social evolution received its deathblow from the two World Wars and we recognize now the inadequacy of its historical basis. But the true inference is not usually drawn that something better was Divinely purposed and has always been possible through the ages.

A. T. Cadoux has well said: 'Had the nation given Him the response for which He asked, and of which He knew them capable, we should not only have seen the forces of early Christianity multiplied more than a thousandfold, but the tremendous force of Jewish patriotism, instead of driving the race on to the fatal fight with Rome, would have found its true activity in a more glorious warfare in conquest of the world. It is reasonable to suppose that this could have happened, and that had it happened the history of the world would have shown at that time a change for which no term would have been adequate but the coming of the Kingdom of God. As it was, Christianity overran the Empire in three centuries and at its fall became the seed of most of what was best in the centuries following: multiplied as it might have been, it would have given the Empire a soul to live by before it was too late, and would certainly have anticipated the barbarian invasions by an invasion of the Gospel that would have obviated the Dark Ages.'[5]

Here is the real moral challenge within the eschatological teaching of Jesus. 'Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.'

[1] Tacitus, *Ann.*, xv. 44.
[2] F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *History of the Christian Church*, 55 f.
[3] *Ib.*, 104, 245–7.
[4] Ph 4^{22}.
[5] *Essays in Christian Thinking*, p. 124.

Literature.

A TRIBUTE TO KARL BARTH.

Reformation Old and New (Lutterworth Press; 18s. net) has been published to mark the occasion of Karl Barth's sixtieth birthday. It is a composite book, and the editor is Dr. F. W. Camfield. The title appears to point to the contributors' united interpretation of Barth's work as a prayer for the reformation and renewal of human life and society through the divinely appointed agency of the Holy Catholic Church, called into being and sustained in its life by the Divine Word and Spirit.

The first part of the book consists of an essay by the editor on 'The Development and Present Stage of the Theology of Karl Barth.' The essay gives a useful account of the 'development' of Barth's theology, though one wishes it could have said a little more about the relation of Barth to Brunner and of both to Gogarten. However, more is said by at least two of the other essayists. Dr. Camfield's essay presents also a useful sketch of the 'present stage' of Barth's theology—that is, as Barth's theology appears in the first two volumes of his Church Dogmatics (The Doctrine of the Word of God, The Doctrine of God). The third volume, in so far as already published, was not available when these essays were written.

While Dr. Camfield's whole contribution is timely as well as useful, it suffers in interest from the general and summary terms in which it is, almost of necessity, couched; one misses, too, Scriptural and Dogmatic references, such as serve to point the meaning in the original.

Exposition in general terms is largely characteristic also of some of the essays composing the second part of the book. But in the essay, 'Reformation Issues To-day,' Dr. John McConnachie has added to our indebtedness to him for clear and pointed summaries of Barth's positions. In his opinion no one has done more than Barth 'to reinterpret, transform, and illumine the issues of the Reformation for our day'; and he expounds those issues as theological, ecclesiastical, and ethical.

In the essay, 'The Word of God and the Nature of Man,' Dr. T. F. Torrance offers an able and scholarly discussion of the issues theology raises about our knowledge of man, particularly Calvinistic theology as endorsed by Karl Barth. The author goes direct to Calvin for his material, and it is not his fault if we do not grasp what the Reformed theology means by the *imago dei*.

The Rev. G. S. Hendry writes an attractive essay, likely to be the most readily understood and appreciated of all the essays, on 'The Rediscovery of the Bible' (a title not of his own choosing). It was Barth's challenge, he says, which gave the decisive impulse to the recent effort to recover the theological interpretation of the Bible as the Word of God. He dwells on one phase of that effort: the new concern to grasp the unity of the Bible, which is in line with Barth's own declaration that the exegesis of canonical Scripture is the only possible goal of Biblical science.

Dr. H. F. Lovell Cocks, in writing an essay on 'The Faith That Saves,' described as 'the sinner's acknowledgment of the living God who encounters him in His Word,' succeeds in giving his subject a wide setting in Reformed and Protestant principles; and the Rev. D. T. Jenkins, writing on 'The Church Catholic and Reformed,' is successful in reminding us that the chief special task of Christians in this generation is to restore 'the missing half of the Church's life,' which is the congregation or worshipping community.

The influence of Karl Barth further appears in the two remaining essays. The first, by Dr. H. A. Hodges on 'The Crisis in Philosophy,' is marked by a sombre view of the human effort in philosophy, conjoined with a large claim for Christ, as witness the following: 'In the tumult of the impersonal forces of Nature and history the personal presence of Christ is found. And Christian faith is simply the recognition of this encounter when it occurs.' The last essay, by the Rev. W. A. Whitehouse on 'The State and Divine Law,' touches upon the subject among others of Natural Law, to which much attention has been recently given. Here is how he would present the truth behind the classical doctrine: 'Any State is a sinful organism, acting in a sinful situation, but by virtue of Christ's redeeming work and the subjection of the State to Him, it is possible for that State so to act that, in the name of Jesus Christ, its action may be upheld as right. When it does so, that action will also be affirmed as reasonable and just by all men of good will and right reason.'

W. Fulton.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The Claims of the Church of England, by the Archbishop of York (Hodder & Stoughton; 15s. net).

This large and comprehensive work by Dr. Cyril Garbett is in the good sense a piece of propaganda (p. 6). It describes what the Church of England stands for, the work it has done and is doing and its great opportunities for service in the future. Dr. Garbett summarizes the contents of the book in a few sentences at the outset. 'First and foremost the Church of England is the historic Catholic Church of this land. (There is some dubiety about what 'this land' means. Presumably it is England in the strict and literal sense.) It rejects the claims of the Pope, appealing to Scripture and the teaching of the ancient fathers for the justification of its faith. In doctrine and worship it is scriptural, catholic, and reasonable. It has toleration and comprehensiveness, a consistent appeal to sound learning and a combination

of authority and freedom which are not possessed to such a high degree by any other church in Christendom. Its fruits are seen in the holiness of many of its members, both living and departed, in its influence for good on the nation, in its expansion overseas and in its work for Christian reunion.'

Some of these statements receive considerable extension in the chapters that follow. Dr. Garbett, for example, rejects the definition of catholic as 'universal.' It includes possession of the ancient Scriptures, Creeds, Sacraments, and Apostolic Ministry. This narrower meaning disposes of Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Wesleyans, and the rest, and leaves the field to Episcopalian churches. But 'catholic' also includes 'protestant,' for the Reformation gave to the Church four boons, freedom from the Papacy, spiritual freedom for the individual Christian, freedom of access to the Scriptures, and openness and simplicity in its services. But, while 'catholic' is thus restricted, the comprehensiveness in which Dr. Garbett glories is a marked feature of the Church, and the Archbishop asserts roundly that 'in no other church can there be found such various schools of thought.' About the question of authority Dr. Garbett has some difficulty, and finally finds relief in a comparison of the authority of the Church with that of our Lord. His authority was paternal not coercive, and so is that of the Church. With regard to the position of the clergy Dr. Garbett has some interesting things to say. He recognizes the evils of Patronage but definitely rejects the idea of election by the people. He deplores the scandalous difference in clerical incomes and also the security of the clergy, which gives them a life tenure however unfit they are for their work.

There are numerous points of lesser importance which may be passed by, but the interest of Dr. Garbett's 'claims' will for most people be centred on certain outstanding assertions. One is, of course, the assertion that the Church of England is the Catholic Church in this land. Another is that she possesses the Apostolic ministry. A third is that she possesses authority with freedom. And, a final and most contentious point, the claim that she has done a great work for the reunion of the churches. These are all challenging statements, and one can imagine what an intelligent member of another church would say of them. He would say, first, that 'catholic' means 'universal' and nothing more, and that all Christian believers who are loyal to Christ, in whatever church, belong to the Catholic Church. He would say, secondly, that the Church of England does not possess the Apostolic ministry, for, if there is anything certain about the New Testament Church, and the Churches founded by St. Paul, it is that they were governed by elders, that an elder was sometimes called an overseer (or bishop) because that was his function, his official title being Presbyter. He would say, in the third place, that freedom is just what the Church of England does not possess. It has not the power to order its own worship. For when, owing to the pressure of necessity, it compiled a new Prayer Book, Parliament rejected it and refused to allow this worship.

But the part of Dr. Garbett's book which will arouse most heat in the kind of person I am imagining is the claim to have done great service in the cause of reunion. Dr. Garbett quotes the famous Lambeth appeal, acknowledging 'all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body.' And the question that at once arises in the member of another church is this: Why, then, not receive those members to whom the Lambeth appeal is directed into fellowship at the Lord's Table? How artificial, he will feel, is the suggestion that this Communion at the Holy Table is the goal of union, not its first step. And how grievous to the Christian spirit are such resolutions as have been passed by Church of England bodies that in exceptional circumstances and under exceptional conditions members of other churches may be admitted to the Holy Communion celebrated by Anglican priests. Along these lines I am afraid that no real advance to reunion can be made. The answer given by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to the Church of England representatives after some tentative conferences is that which will always be given by Christian churches which believe in their own Christian standing: 'that any agreement with regard to the Orders and Sacraments of the conferring Churches can only be based on the recognition of the equal standing of the accepted communicants and ministers in each.'

It would be ungrateful not to acknowledge the great ability and the fine spirit of the writer of this book. To members of his own church it will give reassurance. To all others it will be interesting and provocative. He has carried out a difficult task in a fashion that, in spite of inevitable differences, secures our respect and admiration.

F. J. Rae.

MOSES.

It seems a far cry to the days when Eduard Meyer (in 1906) expressed the view that Moses was not a historical personality, even though some writers still get little farther than to say that if history had recorded nothing about him we should have had to invent him. Jew and Christian alike, therefore, will eagerly read Professor Martin Buber's latest book, which bears the simple title *Moses* (East and West Library, London: 12s. 6d. net).

Dr. Buber's critical position is fundamental to the understanding of his work. He rejects the generally prevailing 'documentary hypothesis' (J. E., etc.). Instead, the Bible narratives as we have them are the results of a reworking and expansion of oral and written traditions which are contemporary, or nearly so, with the events recorded. The task of the Bible scholar is to scale off the later accretions until he arrives at the original deposit, which commonly discloses itself

by characteristic rhythm, repetitions, and word-plays. 'Doublets,' therefore, so far from being evidences of different documents, are really an essential feature of the original unitary tradition.

Dr. Buber seems to think that the documentary critics look upon 'sources' as the free literary compositions of their authors, mirroring forth their own conceptions rather than those of the times to which they ostensibly refer. That may once have been so; but is it necessarily so to-day? Was not Dr. Wheeler Robinson always insisting that there are no 'bare facts' of history, and would not he, who accepted the documentary theory without reserve, have agreed entirely with Usener (in 1897) that 'what finds expression in the saga is not a post-factum transfiguration of a historical recollection but a process which follows on the events, "in their footsteps, so to say"'? Wheeler Robinson was not your 'self-assured professional scholar who proposes to treat everything recorded as literature pure and simple, and believes that he can equate it all to, and comprehend it by, literary categories.' He could have said with Dr. Buber that 'we shall not regain a historical nucleus of the saga by eliminating the function of enthusiasm from it,' that 'history cannot be dissevered from the historical wonder,' and he could likewise have written of 'the ever-recurrent contemporaneousness of that which once befell.'

There need, therefore, be no serious quarrel between the source-critics and Dr. Buber. But does his method recover more for history than the critics do? The reader who expects to have the Moses of his childhood fully restored to him will be disappointed. Dr. Buber frankly says he cannot undertake to submit a consecutive record of the course of events. We do not know when or how the Exodus took place, nor where Sinai was. The birth stories of Moses are drawn from 'the treasury of legendary motifs common to early humanity.' The negotiations between Moses and Pharaoh can scarcely be fitted into place 'as recording any historical reality.' And so on. All this has a familiar ring; but it goes without saying that Dr. Buber touches nothing without illuminating it with his own inimitable insight, and there will be general agreement with him that 'if we take away all the legendary traits of Moses we must still recognize him as the spiritual force in which the Ancient Orient concentrated itself at its close and surmounted itself.'

C. R. North.

JEWISH MYTH AND RITUAL.

A great deal of discussion was occasioned in the last decade by two volumes edited by Professor S. H. Hooke on the 'myth and ritual pattern' of the Ancient East ('Myth and Ritual' [1932] and 'The Labyrinth' [1935]). On the whole, the contention that Hebrew religion was influenced by this general culture pattern was more favourably received on the Continent, especially in Scandinavia, than it was in this country. It was generally agreed that the Prophets reacted strongly against anything that savoured of 'Baalism.' The question was, to what extent was the *official* religion of pre-exilic times influenced by the cycle of ideas about the dying and rising god and the associated divinity of the king? The area of discussion has now been considerably widened by Dr. Raphael Patai, F.R.A.I., Director of the Palestinian Institute of Folklore and Ethnology, in a small but immensely learned book entitled *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual* (Nelson; 8s. 6d. net). Dr. Patai brings together materials from post-Biblical Jewish literature which go to show that the 'pattern' can still be discerned in Judaism even after the destruction of the Second Temple. His finding is that it is 'sufficiently clear . . . that the purpose of the (New Year) ceremonies could be none other than one, namely, to induce the fall of rain.' This may well be so; but many of the passages he quotes must prompt his readers to ask whether they are genuinely reminiscent of ideas which were temporarily driven underground by the reforming zeal of Ezra, or whether they are only typical rabbinical exegesis of what were, by the time they found their place in the Old Testament, already fossilized remains. Much of what the rabbis say seems too conventional and even puerile to be evidence of a still living tradition. However, the materials are here, and only an expert Talmudist like Dr. Patai could have assembled them.

C. R. North.

DANTE.

The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri: III. *Paradiso,* with translation and comment by John D. Sinclair (Lane; 12s. 6d. net).

'Who but Dante could have introduced any gentleness into Hell?' asked Byron, and went on—'and Dante's Heaven is all love and glory and majesty.' And Professor Bickersteth, in his verse translation of the *Paradiso* published fifteen years ago, addresses himself to the reader 'with whom the third and greatest cantica of the Divine Comedy counts (outside the Bible) as the supreme expression in literature of the Christian faith.' Any presentment of the *Paradiso* in a foreign tongue must be an exacting task. Profound and exact scholarship is only one of the many things which are required. Mr. Sinclair has not failed us in the third volume of his great translation. His prose reads like English—and dignified and beautiful English, and it is worthy of its theme. The short notes which follow each canto, if not sufficient for the ordinary reader, convey a great deal of welcome information in a very small space, while the lengthier notes form a beautiful comment on the progress of the poem and are literally invaluable. The reader of Dante has a wide choice of translations—from Cary to Binyon and Bickersteth and now Mr. Sinclair. He will probably be well advised to begin with the eminently handy 'Temple' volumes, but when he has finished with them he cannot do better than address himself to Mr. Sinclair. Then, with a pretty fair grasp of the great poem as a whole, he will be the better able to appreciate the beauty of Professor Bickersteth's

verse. The present volume—Italian and English on opposite pages—is truly a delight to read and to handle. Mr. Sinclair has given us a gift of refreshing beauty in days when we need such gifts, and the publishers are to be congratulated on producing the volume at such a moderate price.

JOHN WILSON BAIRD.

While perhaps not a few will read *The Law of Faith*, by Norman Grubb (Lutterworth Press ; 6s. net), and remain in some doubt as to what exactly the 'law' is, nobody will read it without profit. Mr. Grubb passed through a long experience of quest before he found the answer to his disquiet in complete surrender to the Divine Will, and he tries to guide others to the secret of peace. He makes an excellent point to start with—faith is not a gift for which we need to pray ; faith is innate in every human being, just as love is. Life without faith in something is inconceivable. But like love in the natural man it is misdirected. The regenerate do not receive faith as something they never had before, their faith gets a new object, just as their love does. Mr. Grubb writes with pleasant vigorous style, though once or twice he degenerates into near-slang. A lover of Scripture, he is insistent that Scripture-loving never means slavish adherence to the letter. The supreme guidance for the Christian comes from the indwelling Spirit of Christ. If many have taught this before him, Mr. Grubb does it in his own way, which will repay study.

Do you wish, with a smattering of Greek, to be able to read the Greek New Testament with pleasure and profit ? If you do, *Lexical Aids for Students of New Testament Greek*, by Bruce M. Metzger, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of New Testament, Princeton Theological Seminary (published by the author at Princeton ; 5s. net), will help you. It is both original and practical. Its starting-point is the psychological principle that man learns by associating the new with the old, the strange with the familiar. Part I. of the Lexical Aids makes use of this principle of associative learning by supplying, after the English definition of Greek words, such English derivatives as may be of assistance in remembering the meaning of the Greek vocabulary. The Greek words in the list, moreover, have been selected and arranged in accord with their frequency in the New Testament. For example, the start is made with words occurring more than five hundred times, and Part I. ends with words occurring ten times. Part II. makes a different application of the same psychological principle. Here are exhibited the family relationships among words of frequent and less frequent occurrence. After one has got a minimum working vocabulary of words one can go on to learn such additional words as resemble in meaning and form those already known. When you have mastered, say five hundred words, in the first part, you can go on to the second part ('words classified according to their root'). It is fairly certain that there are many people with just a very little knowledge of Greek who would love to read the New Testament easily in the original, and this intelligent guide seems to promise a not too arduous way of achieving this ambition.

In *What Are the Churches Doing?* (Religious Education Press ; 5s. net) the Rev. John Foster, D.D., has published a selection of the Broadcast Talks he recently gave under the same title. These talks attracted widespread attention and interest, and many will be glad to have them in book form. There are thirty of them, with an addendum. They cover a very wide field, surveying what the churches are to-day doing 'from China to Peru.' The educative value of this world-wide investigation is bound to be great. Even students of Church History in our Theological Colleges know so little about Christianity to-day. They know the early period, they know about the Reformation, and probably get a sketch of the history of their own denomination. But the time table has no room for a wide survey of what is happening to the churches to-day the wide world over. This study, so brilliantly presented, will go far to supply that lack. And many a sermon will be strikingly illustrated by some of the stories told.

The Rev. E. C. E. Bourne, Walton-le-Dale, Preston, has sought to mark the three-hundredth anniversary of Laud's death by writing a book which should correct the common view that Laud was a man of fine personal character, but second-rate ability. The volume has appeared later than the author intended. It is entitled *The Anglicanism of William Laud* (S.P.C.K. ; 12s. 6d. net), and contains among other illustrations a reproduction of the portrait by Van Dyck. In attempting to form a coherent picture of the principles from which Laud's theories and actions were derived, Mr. Bourne has made himself at home in the ecclesiastical atmosphere of the seventeenth century in England. He sums up Laud's principles in the phrase 'unity and order,' and finds the key to Laud's character in his passionate devotion to the ideal thus outlined. To that ideal he was constant, and for it he died. But this in itself might not argue much intellectual ability. Mr. Bourne would, however, remind us that while Laud made no great personal contribution to constructive theology, he was deeply versed in the Fathers and in the Scholasticism of St. Thomas, and that it was not merely his steadfastness unto death but also his grasp of doctrinal distinctions that 'preserved in the Church which he loved that balanced faith and tolerant charity which are her glory and her strength.'

Marriage in the Bible and the Early Christian Church.

I. The Old Testament Foundation.

By Professor A. S. Herbert, M.A., B.D., Selly Oak Colleges.

The Christian view of marriage must derive from the teaching of Jesus as reported in the Gospels, and as further explicated in the remaining New Testament writings. But that teaching, in turn, as our Lord explicitly affirms, has for its context the teaching of the Old Testament and the interpretation of that teaching by the Rabbis. The purpose of this article is to summarize that teaching. It is often assumed that in any teaching on marriage the Old Testament were best left out of account, that it contains material of academic and antiquarian interest only. The Marcionite heresy persists! What is overlooked is that the New Testament appears to accept without explicit contradiction or modification the Old Testament teaching, and, further, our Lord directs His hearers to the Old Testament for an adequate appreciation of the marriage relationship. Now, the Old Testament Law does not furnish us with explicit requirements about monogamy; its teaching on faithfulness to the marriage bond by both parties does not satisfy the Christian (or the Jewish) conscience; in its treatment of sexual offences, it bears more hardly on the woman than on the man. It will, however, be contended that there are enunciated certain great principles which go behind these requirements, of which, in fact, these requirements are the inevitable consequence. This might have been expected in that there are no important differences to-day as between Judaism and Christianity in their teaching on marriage.

That the Old Testament recognizes polygyny (but not polyandry) is sufficiently well known to need no more than a summary statement. Polygyny and concubinage are taken for granted in, for example, the lives of Abraham and Jacob. A similar state of affairs appears in the Books of Samuel and Kings: Elkanah, the father of Samuel, had two wives; David and Solomon had many wives (tenth century B.C.) as had Josiah and Jehoiachin (seventh and sixth centuries B.C.). No disapproval of the practice is expressed by the editors of the Books, except in so far as non-Israelite women were introduced into the royal household (1 K 11^{2}); the objection is based on the fact that non-Israelite religions and deities were being introduced in Yahweh's land. The practice is accepted and regulated in the Book of the Covenant (Ex $21^{8.\,10}$), where an attempt is made to safeguard the woman's interests. Again the practice is recognized in Dt 21^{15}, where it is forbidden to show partiality to the children of the favourite wife. The latest development of the Law Code (Lv 18^{18}) does not apparently forbid polygyny, although it does forbid a man to marry two sisters. The sacred obligation of Levirate marriage must obviously in most instances have been laid on a man already married. This is, of course, a special case, and its purpose is clear, namely, to maintain a 'family' which was in danger of being lost. Significantly, however, the manner in which the Law is stated in Dt $25^{5ff.}$ shows that the custom was falling into desuetude. A study of the legal and narrative portions of the Old Testament from the earliest to the latest strata shows that polygyny was recognized as legal in Israel. It is not possible to state to what extent this was carried out in practice. Since the numbers of men and women in any population are approximately equal, we may say with confidence that monogamy must have been the rule, and polygyny the exception as in other polygamous societies.

The words used specifically of husband and wife are 'ba'al' and 'be'ulah' respectively. The husband is the owner and lord, the wife is the owned. In law, therefore, the wife is the husband's property, and while he has not absolute rights, she has few rights of her own. Her position in the household was to be her husband's helper, and her primary function was to bear his children. It was the highest obligation laid upon the man, and therefore upon the woman who had been brought into the family, to improve the family inheritance and to strengthen the family by the bearing of children. This is the basis of the laws against adultery, the committal of which was punishable by death for man or woman, Dt 22^{22}, Lv 20^{10}. Irregular union between a man and an unmarried or unbetrothed woman is not so punished, though the man must pay the bride-price. But for a married woman such an act is liable to the death penalty. Everything is subordinate to the primary obligation of increasing and maintaining the integrity of the family.

This is the position as regulated by Law and exemplified in narrative among the Hebrews up to at least the fourth century B.C. It may be noted that Hebrew Law and custom is in this matter on no lower a plane than most, and higher than many, in the pre-Christian and non-Christian world. But the picture is not complete until we take into account also certain profoundly important

principles that underlie Law and custom, which caused modification of that Law even though it was regarded as Divine Law. The emphasis on the sacredness of the family is obvious enough. One of the great blessings of life is to have children, Ps $127^{4.5}$, Pr 17^{6}. Job's vindication after his great witness-bearing before God, angels and men reaches its fitting climax in that he begets seven sons and three daughters, and, in his old age, is surrounded by his descendants to the fourth generation. It is to maintain the welfare of the family that both husband and wife increased wealth and guarded their property. It is to that end that they chose wives for their sons and husbands for their daughters. That was the explicit purpose of Levirate marriage; that appears also to have been the purpose of polygyny. We may exclude from this discussion the royal practice of marrying numerous wives, which appears to have been a normal mode of making political alliances. In other instances of polygyny (which are few and mainly confined to two wives, or a wife and a slave concubine), it is often explicitly stated that the wife takes the initiative in providing her husband with the means for increasing the family; cf. Gn $16^{1ff.}$

Although the *legal* position of the wife appears to have been little higher than that of the husband's property, this is not an adequate picture of her position in Hebrew life. One has only to read the noble eulogy in Pr 31^{10-31} to realize the high estimate ascribed to the good wife. There is little said about divorce in the Old Testament. It is alluded to by Jeremiah, specifically required by Ezra in the particular situation he was trying to meet, and on religious grounds, and vigorously repudiated in the name of God by Malachi and in such terms as might well have had a place in the teaching of Jesus. The Law of Dt 24^{1-4} is remarkable, both in what it says and what it has been thought to say. Taken out of its context, it appears to allow a man to divorce his wife for the most trivial of reasons. What the Law is doing is to place a check on a practice which caused grievous hardship to the woman. It shall no longer be sufficient for a man to say to his wife, 'You are no longer my wife!' and so turn her out of his house, shamed in the eyes of her neighbours. He must give her a written document, presumably containing the cause of divorce. Now this in ancient Israel was no simple matter. Few were able to write, and the man would need to go, probably to some Levite or judge for the document. He would need, moreover, to be very careful in preferring his charge, since the laws against slander, especially against women, were very severe. The Law was indeed written because of the hardness of men's hearts! (It is notorious that this Law was interpreted by some of the Rabbis of our Lord's day to justify divorce for the most trivial of reasons. Even here, however, one must be on one's guard against equating logical inference with practice. The Rabbis sometimes pressed an argument from the Law to a logical and absurd conclusion in order to demonstrate that another interpretation was necessary.)

It is from the prophets that we gain an insight into the true understanding of the marriage relationship which Law cannot give. This is particularly true of the prophecy of Hosea. The whole significance of this prophet's tragic domestic experience presupposes that not for a moment could he contemplate marriage to more than one wife. Love such as his was for one woman. Moreover, this is a prerequisite of the offering he is bidden by God to make of his tragedy, to set before Israel the relationship between God and the nation. A great human love, offered to God and sanctified by Him, has penetrated to the true significance of marriage. This same conception of the husband/wife relationship is exquisitely expressed in Is 54. Thus it is not surprising that in the post-exilic Wisdom writings the monogamous relationship appears to be normal. Even the wealthy Job has only one wife.

Marriage among the Hebrews was at first no different from marriage among their contemporaries; but it underwent certain important modifications. The reason is not far to seek. It lies in the nature of Israel's religion as interpreted by the prophets. For marriage was essentially a religious matter. It is a concern of God, and not simply a matter for human inclination and convenience (we may recall the Rabbinical saying 'There are three concerned in marriage—God, a man, and a woman; and the will of God is supreme'). This at once leads to the insight concerning the man/woman relationship expressed in the Creation stories of Genesis to which our Lord pointed. The summit of God's creative activity is in bringing Man into being, the male and female forming the unity; each is indispensable to the other; together they form a complete human being. Now it is obvious that such an affirmation is capable of ever-deepening interpretation, and it is not surprising that the Jews were distinguished in the ancient world for their high view of marriage. But in the Genesis accounts there is a frank recognition and religious acceptance of the fact that the man/woman relationship is much more than a physical one—as we distinguish physical and spiritual. On the other hand, false asceticism or religious celibacy had no part in the Hebrew tradition. The whole relationship was in the purpose of God, and must be true to that purpose. That is what makes it 'very good.'

The Marcan Parable of the Child in the Midst.

By the Reverend Matthew Black, Ph.D., D.Litt., The University, Leeds.

How to relate the official Marcan 'interpretation' of the acted Parable of the Child in the Midst ('Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me,' etc.) to the previous teaching on humility and service in connexion with which the Parable was enacted, is the *crux interpretum* of Mk 9^{33-37}. It is, however, one only of several puzzling features in the Marcan version of the Parable.[1] Indeed, for preaching purposes, one turns with relief to the simple clarity of the fuller version of St. Matthew ($18^{1ff.}$). Scholarship, however, has to deal with problems; and Marcan *stromata*, if the Clementine term may be applied to the occasional 'patchwork' on the Marcan tapestry, have yielded before to critical analysis.

In answer to the first question, the connexion of 9^{37} with 9^{35}, it has been said that in *v.*[37] Jesus 'is affirming again, in his striking way, that humility and service are the marks of greatness in his kingdom. . . .'[2] Obviously that is what this commentator felt ought to be the meaning of the Parable: but to go on to claim that in *v.*[37] it actually is stated to be so, is paralogizing. The inability to recognize a *non sequitur* where one is manifestly present, arises, in all such interpretations, from the assumption of the infallibility of the Marcan order and arrangement.

If Mark is right, then Jesus spoke *v.*[37] after *v.*[36]: in that case, so far as a connexion between *v.*[37] and *v.*[35] is concerned, we stand before a *non liquet*. If, on the other hand, the Marcan arrangement of these Child-sayings is open to question, then it may be suggested that the only connexion between *v.*[37] and its present context is a purely formal one, namely, the word παιδίον.[3]

In $10^{13ff.}$, the next group of Child-sayings in Mark, the story of Jesus' reception of children when His disciples would have driven them away, *v.*[14], 'Suffer the little children' etc. is followed at *v.*[15] by 'Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God ὡς παιδίον, he shall not enter therein.' Again the connexion is imperfect. But we do have in 10^{15} what the context so urgently requires and does not get at 9^{36}, namely, the Child held up as an example of humility. A. W. F. Blunt, who noted this,[4] but without further comment, might easily have gone on to point out (their congruity is patent) that 9^{37} forms the logical conclusion and climax to the incident and Child-sayings group at $10^{13ff.}$.

Are these two sayings then, 9^{37} and 10^{15}, simply in their wrong places? If they are, then it can only be due to faulty editing on the part of the author of Mark or an early editor of the Gospel, for both Matthew and Luke have Mark's erratic logion (Mt 18^{5}, Lk 9^{48}). That the Marcan editor of the sayings has had some difficulty with his material may be further deduced from 9^{35a}, where Jesus 'called' His disciples in the middle of a conversation with them. The position of 9^{35b} too, the teaching on humility and service, which in Mark leads into the Parable, must also arouse suspicion, for in Luke, who is here following an independent tradition,[5] this is regarded as the whole point of the incident, and he places his 9^{48c} appropriately at the end.

When we turn from questions of sequence to interpretation, a problem meets us in the presence in Mark only of ideas of *service* as well as humility in connexion with the Parable of the Child in the Midst—'If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, *and servant of all* (πάντων διάκονος)' (9^{35b}). Both Matthew and Luke omit all mention of service or 'the servant of all': their parables teach humility and childlikeness only. In omitting Mark's 'servant of all,' their reasoning may have been that, while a child may be held up as a fitting example of humility, it can scarcely be made an example of service. For whatever reason, the words are simply dropped in Matthew and Luke.

It may be that these words are another 'erratic word-block' in Mark, this time from the parallel sayings-group on greatness as service in $10^{43ff.}$. But before acquiescing in this or in any other explanation, it is worth looking again at the Marcan text. The juxtaposition of διάκονος, and, three words later, παιδίον ($9^{35.\ 36}$), while of no significance in Greek, arrests attention and becomes immediately illumining in the well-known ambiguity of Aramaic *talya*, 'child' or 'servant.' If in the Aramaic story it was this word which was first rendered by διάκονος in

[1] This is, I believe, the correct term. See below.

[2] E. P. Gould, *Mark* [I.C.C.], *in loc.*

[3] Cf. A. H. M'Neile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 260: '. . . this verse [37=Mt 18^{5}] must originally have been unconnected with the incident.'

[4] *Mark* [Clarendon Bible], 210.

[5] Luke's 'moral' (9^{48c}) is not identical with 9^{35b} in Mark, but points to some common source.

9^{35b} and then by παιδίον in 9^{36} (or *vice versa*, in the above sequence), then the Child in the Midst becomes a dramatised play on the Aramaic word for Child and Servant. Further, if 10^{15}, as has been suggested, is really part of the exposition of the Parable and belongs together with 9^{35b}, then it ought to be understood as, 'Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God *as a servant* (*talya*), he shall not enter therein.'[1]

The Parable would then be in the prophetic (and Semitic) tradition. Teaching based on animate or inanimate objects as texts, as it were, and also turning on a paronomasia or play on the same or similar sounding words are familiar from Jer 1^{11} and Am 8^{2}. Jeremiah is shown in a vision the 'branch of an almond tree'; the latter in Palestine is called 'the wakeful one' (*shaqedh*) because of its early blossoming (in February); and the interpretation of the vision is that God is the Divine Waker or Watcher (*shoqedh*) over His Word to perform it. In Amos, the prophet sees 'a basket of summer fruit' (*qayis*); and the meaning of the vision is that 'the end (*qes*) is come upon my people Israel.' So Jesus sets the Child (*talya*) in the midst of His disciples, and teaches them that true greatness consists in becoming the Servant (*talya*) of all.

The 'incident' is thus a true '*mashal*,' an enigmatic comparison requiring interpretation; and it is at the same time gnomic, containing or leading up to the *sententia*.[2]

That this may well put the Ariadne's thread of the teaching of Jesus on the Child into our hands and not just prove another mare's nest can be supported by other evidence.

So far as the equivalence of παιδίον and *talya* is concerned, the reader who knows no Aramaic may have no misgivings (*talitha*, κοράσιον [Mk 5^{51}] is the fem.). But the real test of the worth of this theory of the incident as a dramatized pun comes when we ask: Can it be shown that Mark's διάκονος also in 9^{35b} goes back to this same Aramaic word? If evidence can be given that it does, then the acted play on words, if not a virtual certainty (certainty it could never be till we possessed the Aramaic teaching), becomes, at any rate, free from reasonable doubts.

A comparison of the sayings-group on service as the true greatness in Mk $10^{43ff.}$ with Lk $22^{24ff.}$ reveals, not only that the Lucan version is fuller and shows traces of being independent of Mark, but also that Luke is incorporating into his Gospel a different Greek translation of the Aramaic teaching from that used by Mark.[3] Whereas Mt $20^{25ff.}$ simply reproduces Mark, Luke contains a number of Synoptic variants which display all the characteristics of being different translations of the same underlying Aramaic. Thus we find Mark's μέγας=Luke's μείζων (*rabba*); πρῶτος =ἡγούμενος (*rish*); δοῦλος=διακονῶν (*'abhda*): and, more particularly to our present purpose, Mark's διάκονος=Luke's νεώτερος. These last two variants can be satisfactorily explained in the light of one common original only, namely, *talya*.[4] We need not hesitate, therefore, in assuming this word as the original behind the Marcan διάκονος at 9^{35}.

It may be conceded that in the original Aramaic story and teaching this same word *talya* was used for both παιδίον and διάκονος, and yet at the same time be maintained that no importance is to be attached to the fact; it is simply coincidence and no play on words was ever intended. The answer to such an objection is to ask: What did Jesus teach about greatness in the Kingdom of God? In what did it consist? Mark gives the answer in his words πάντων διάκονος (*talya*). The idea of service is central to the teaching, and if Jesus took a child (*talya*) in such a connexion and set him in the midst, then any suggestion of coincidence in the use of the common word can scarcely be entertained.[5]

Other interpretations of the Parable of the Child are not excluded by such a suggestion. Indeed, the sheer genius of the Parable lies in the singular appropriateness of a Child to convey, not only a primary lesson on true greatness as humblest service, but secondary and related teaching—that the 'first' should become 'last,' the 'greatest' the 'least' (cf. Luke's μικρότερος). Matthew's 'Except ye be converted and become as little children' does, however, suggest a later reflective interpretation. His saying about 'humbling oneself' ὡς τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο, however, perhaps takes on an even profounder meaning if *talya*, 'servant,' and not 'child' lies behind it. The

[1] In Aramaic, *man d'la m'qabbel malkuth 'laha hekh talya likka 'allel lah.*

[2] The Parable proper may have had its origin in the 'riddle' or *hidha*. Cf. *HDB*, iii. 660 ff. The rabbis relate a number of parables 'concerning a king' and each is known as *mashal l'melekh*, 'parable with reference to a king.' Jesus' Parable is a *mashal* (or *math'la*) *l'talya*, 'parable with reference to a child.'

[3] For a discussion of some of Luke's additions with reference to Aramaic, see my *Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* [Clarendon Press, 1946], 164 ff.

[4] The word means 'infant,' 'child,' or 'youth,' 'servant' (cf. Gael. *gille, gillie*); the Pal. Syr. renders νεώτερος at Jn 21^{18} by this word: it similarly renders παῖς, 'servant' in the story of the Centurion's Servant, and in the Servant passages of Isaiah; cf. also Jer 30^{10}. The ambiguity of *talya* is, of course, shared by παῖς and παιδίον is found meaning 'a young slave lad' (Aristophanes, *Ran.* 32, *Nub.* 137). But there can be no question of such a meaning for it in Mk 9^{35-37}; Mark clearly means 'child.'

[5] For Jesus' employment of the pun in teaching, see my *Aramaic Approach*, 126, 118 ff.

difficulty would then be the deictic τοῦτο. If not original, is it Matthaean interpretation? It is always possible, too, that the 'child' in question was really a humble *famulus*, perhaps the humblest of all the 'boys' in the household at Capernaum, which some think was Peter's. Can it have been such a *servulus* whom Jesus 'summoned' (Mark's ἐφώνησε as an echo of the true tradition preserved in Matthew's προσκαλεσάμενος παιδίον?)

But the main emphasis in Jesus' teaching on Christian greatness does lie, on such a reading of the Parable of the Child in the Midst, upon the humblest service. Mark alone has preserved the primitive tradition and original point of the Parable; his *stroma*, like the biological species, contains a living cell of historical truth in the words καὶ πάντων διάκονος.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Ploughs and Ploughing.

By the Reverend C. M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks.'—Is 2^4.

'No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.'—Lk 9^{62}.

One of the most fascinating sights to watch in our fields is a tractor ploughing, turning up furrow after furrow. I think, however, although it's slower, it's a finer sight to see a brawny pair of horses at it with a flock of birds following in their wake. In Scripture times, too, there were ploughs and ploughmen. Only the ploughs were very primitive, and made of wood and not of steel. On the tip of the ploughshare there was an iron point. Across the necks of the oxen, two of them, there rested the wooden cross-bar or yoke, which yoked them together. Altogether in the Scriptures ploughs or plowshares are referred to about twenty-four times. Our texts are two very famous verses.

The first is a text from the Old Testament. It's that very famous saying by Isaiah: 'And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks.'

That, alas, still isn't true to-day, though it's something all peace lovers are working and planning for. When, for instance, President Truman took office as President of the U.S.A., he noticed on the desk of his private room in the White House the model of a gun. He got put in its place at once the model of a plough, as a reminder that all planning now must be not for war, but for peace.

And, surely, it's more sensible to use iron and steel for making useful things, not destructive ones. One day in Palestine, where stupid people are stirring up hatred and strife, a visitor heard a sound of sweet music. It was an Arab donkey-boy playing a sort of shepherd's pipe. As the traveller drew near he asked to see the boy's flute and found it was half of an old rifle-barrel. It seems the boy had stumbled on the rifle-barrel among the hills, had filed it in two, bored holes in it, and made a flute. And that's the proper way, isn't it, to make the ugly weapons of war into useful articles such as ploughs and instruments to pipe the songs of peace.

The other text is from the New Testament. It's a great saying also, one of the best known sayings of our Lord Himself: 'No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.'

A skilled ploughman knows that to plough a straight furrow he must not look behind him, but keep looking ahead. Once a farm lad who was learning ploughing was instructed by the farmer, his master, always to plough with his eye on an object. On returning and finding the furrows anything but straight the farmer said angrily to the boy:

'I told you, didn't I, to keep your eye fixed on an object?'

Whereupon the boy replied:

'So I did, Sir; but the cow I chose would keep moving.'

In a way it is like that in life too. It isn't possible for anyone of us to plough a straight furrow while looking at something that is always changing; we must look at something or at some one who is steady and sure and unchanging. And Jesus Himself is the only one of whom one can say that. 'Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.'

So for a straight furrow fix your eye on Him.

The Christian Year.

Twentieth Sunday after Trinity.

God—A Fire!

By the Reverend T. Tudor Rhys, B.A., B.D., Hinckley.

'For our God is a consuming fire.'—He 12^{29}.

Right through the Bible, from the Old Testament to the New, God was known to His people under the symbol of fire. What Moses saw in the

burning bush was the fire of the holiness of God. What Israel saw in the flaming pillar was the fire of the presence of God. And the chariots of fire round about Elisha, that was the fire of the all-encompassing power of God. And in the New Testament the same symbol appears. 'I indeed,' said John the Baptist, 'baptize you with water . . . but . . . he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.' And when Christ came, He said: 'I am come to send fire on the earth.' And when He went away He came again as Holy Spirit at Pentecost to the waiting disciples, 'and there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire,' and the fire spread and set three thousand souls aflame in a single day. And there is that saying of Jesus preserved by Origen: 'He who is near me is near the fire.'

Christ is the centre of that fire. But through the long reaches of history that fire has been burning and it is burning now, for our God is a consuming fire.

But what is the point of all this? It is in place at times to consider our human duties, our human activities, and our human ideals. We talk and even sing about what we think of God, about the sacrifices we make and the wonders we are going to do—till we have built Jerusalem. But the great and ultimate question now and always is, not what we think of God, it is what God thinks of us. It is not 'the sacrifice we make, but the sacrifice we trust.' It is not what we are going to do by ourselves alone, but what God is willing and able to do through us, And so the emphasis here is upon God. For our God is a consuming fire.

What kind of a fire, then, is this? It is a three-forked fire. It is the fire of the Enthusiasm of God, the fire of the Unanimity of God and the fire of the Resourcefulness of God.

1. *The Fire of the Enthusiasm of God.* If God is even remotely like a fire He must be a terribly active God. For a fire, when it really gets going, does not stop until it has finished its work. And our God is a consuming fire.

That is to say, man is not the only active participant in human history. To read some of the books that are appearing to-day you might think that, in this world, we have only ourselves. In his book, *The Emergence of Man*, Mr. Gerald Heard says: 'History is the history not of men, but of Man—a being that is aeon by aeon growing in reality and making it more possible for men to find their fulfilment in him.' You have only to read your history books or your morning newspaper to be reminded that men are full of energy and enthusiasm—making laws and breaking them, building systems and smashing them, erecting monuments and pulling them down again—the same monuments. If man is the only actor in the drama of human history—! But he is not. Man has not the whole place to himself, there is some one else at work. God is at work. Without haste and without rest—our God is a consuming fire, the fire of the enthusiasm of God. But not mere enthusiasm. There is nothing so fatuous as an undirected enthusiasm. There is nothing so perilous as a misdirected enthusiasm. God's consuming fire is also

2. *The Fire of the Unanimity of God.* In his book, *The Meaning of History*, Nicolas Berdyaev says that, on the whole, human history has been a failure. 'Not one single project elaborated within the historical process has ever proved successful. None of the problems of any given historical epoch whatsoever has been solved, no aims attained, no hopes realized.' If one looks for a reason for this failure one cannot fail to think of man's fatal lack of unanimity. Men begin a thing with energy and continue it with enthusiasm, but, sooner or later, there comes a point when men split up into groups and parties and schisms, sects and factions and cliques. On 14th October last, at the end of the Paris Peace Conference, Mr. Molotov made a sweeping condemnation of the Conference, of its results, its methods, and of its spirit. That is to say, of its lack of unanimity! In speaking of his native land Mr. Bernard Shaw said: 'If religion is that which binds men to one another and irreligion that which sunders, then I must testify that I found religion in its musical genius and irreligion in its churches.' 'Till *we* have built Jerusalem . . .' But men will never (apart from God) build anything of the kind, for as soon as they get as far as the first courses they will begin to divide into groups and parties and schisms.

All this means that our only hope is in the unanimity of God, and our God is a consuming fire. That is what the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity is trying to express. One God, three Persons, and all three Persons willing and working together with enthusiastic unanimity. There was a 'moment' in Eternity when God the Father wanted the society of beings like ourselves who would love Him and serve Him. That was the first emergency of the Godhead and He was equal to it. 'In the beginning God created. . . .' But something went wrong. Sin came in and there arose the second emergency. But God was equal to it. 'For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son.' And the Son was willing to be given. But men crucified the Son and He was raised up from the dead and He ascended into heaven leaving His followers helpless and the world an orphaned world. But He was equal to this third emergency. He came again at Pentecost as Holy Spirit. 'And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire.' The Father's creative energy, the Son's redemptive love, the Spirit's guiding light—the unanimity of the Triune God. And that Divine dynamic is centred upon every individual (if only he knew it), upon you and me, upon the Church and upon every church: 'where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.'

3. *The Fire of the Resourcefulness of God.* Francis Thompson says that in every grass blade God is 'focussed to a point.' How much more is that true, and to what a higher potential, of every human soul and of the Church of Jesus Christ. The inexhaustible energy of the Triune God at the disposal of every church! Each church a focus, a centre of this Divine dynamic! One

wonders what would happen if all church members now available were to meet in their own churches for concentrated, purposeful worship.

We can learn a great deal from the electrical crisis. Electrical power is cut when people use too much of it. Spiritual power, on the other hand, is cut when people use too little. You limit the resources of the Grid when your demands are too high, and we are asked to burn less fuel. You limit the resources of God, on the other hand, when your demands upon Him are too low, and we are asked to have more faith.

Never be afraid to ask too much of God or of asking too often. However heavy the traffic may be, God will never have to 'shed the load.' On the contrary, 'Prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it.'

Expect great things from God: attempt great things for God.

God's power grows the more you draw on it, for our God is a consuming fire.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Sacredness of Strength.

BY THE REVEREND R. LEONARD SMALL, M.A., CRAMOND.

'My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness.'—2 Co 12^9.

It is a far cry from Samson, the champion strong man of the Old Testament, to Paul, the Mr. Standfast of the New, yet concerning both these lives, each demonstrating in widely contrasting fashion a certain type of strength, the Bible enunciates the same clear principle, the strength of each came from God to be used for His purposes. When 'the Lord had departed from him' Samson's strength was utterly gone; Paul, in spite of his inescapable handicap of weakness could still declare confidently, 'I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.' That strength, all strength of every sort, comes from God, is given by Him for a purpose, and must be used with a due sense of sacredness, is a principle which badly requires to be reaffirmed to-day. In every walk of life, in every sphere of human endeavour we lament the lost sense of responsibility, the fading of all feeling of sacredness. Do we not need to remind ourselves, in the light of such a text as this that we are not puppets, dancing as fate may pull the strings, we are not mechanical toys, wound up by Omnipotence and set to run hither and thither until our power runs down and only God can renew our strength, we are not empty pitchers to be filled and refilled by the power of God, we are persons endowed by God with strength of various sorts, to use as we will as if it were our own? Do we not need to remember both that a man's strength still comes from God whether that man realizes it or not, and that, the more a man regards his strength as sacred, the more fully, in Paul's own phrase, 'the power of Christ may rest upon him?'

As we seek to develop this principle of the sacredness of strength it becomes clearly established at the outset that, if strength is sacred, then *a man must make the most of the strength he has.* With what varying degrees of strength does God endow different men—yes, and the same man at different stages in his life! There is the strength that handles daily throughout the years the heavy tasks of field and forge, of mine and market, and there is the strength which must stand up each day to long hours of strain, as in the transport services. There are people who can take their strength for granted all their days, and others, like Paul, who must often wonder how they are to go on at all, or get through the day, so handicapped are they by weakness. One man in his time will know the overflowing energy of youth, when life is running in full tide through him, then the effort of middle-age when he is always conscious of the out-going of energy, then the declining powers of the years when he realizes that he cannot do at all what once he did so easily. The decisive thing for each one is that whatever type or degree of strength is given to him, at whatever stage in life he may be, he should make the most of the strength he has. In the eleventh chapter of this Epistle Paul gives an account of his own achievements and experiences, a record of endurance and fortitude of which the strongest athlete, the toughest veteran might be proud. And the secret of this wonderful record by a man so sorely handicapped lay in the resolve recorded in our text, the determination that if he might not have more strength and less weakness he would at least make the most of the strength he had. What a challenge to us all! All the way from the man who ought, under God, to be listening to the demand to do an honest day's work for a living wage, to the man who so wearies himself in well-doing that he overstrains his own faith, and loses peace of mind and poise of spirit, all the way from the many in our churches who do little or nothing for the Kingdom of Christ to the usual few who are in everything, to each and all of us this challenge comes: 'Am I making the most of the strength I have?'

But no man will continually make the most of the strength he has unless he realizes that *a man must keep himself fit for something worth while.* Merely keeping fit for the sake of keeping fit may be a natural expression of the energy of youth, or it may be a fetish for middle-age, but as an activity of normal life it soon begins to pall. If a man wants badly enough to climb the Matterhorn or win the 220 yards, or swim the Channel, or gain his Master's Certificate, or his Fellowship, he will keep himself fit to achieve that purpose which seems to him to be worth while. Nothing less will induce him to face the self-discipline which is always the price of maintaining at its best the strength he has. The whole principle of the sacredness of strength involves a new vision of the purpose to which our strength, of whatever type it be, can be applied. Indeed it would seem

that there runs through life the principle that strength must be applied to purpose. There is a 'knack' about the wheeling of a loaded barrow, or carrying a sack of coal, or pulling a signal lever, or hauling a trawl net, just as there is a 'knack' about winning the confidence of a nervous patient or arousing the interest of a listless congregation—in every case you have the application of a certain kind of strength to a particular purpose. There was a 'knack,' too, about Paul's amazing achievement in spite of every weakness, and his secret is revealed again and again. 'This one thing I do . . . I press toward the mark.' He was able to keep going because he was always seeking to keep fit for a purpose infinitely worth while. How he challenges us here—especially those of us—and we are not few—who are just keeping going without any clear sense of purpose, desperately in need of some new vision of the meaning of the tasks to which, so earnestly and even grimly, we apply our strength. A man must keep his strength fit and fine for something worth while.

Finally, *a man must spend his strength freely and unselfishly*, if he regards it as sacred. There can be little doubt that Paul sought to be relieved of his 'thorn in the flesh' not merely out of a natural desire to be fitter and therefore more free in Christ's service, and not even because he wanted more fully to co-operate in God's high purpose, but because of his sense of how many in the churches he had founded depended on him. There was so much to do, so many to advise and strengthen in the faith, and such limited strength for the doing of it. Any man would do well in these days of doubt and bewilderment to think of his own strength in similar terms. Each of us in some degree is like the centre pole of a small marquee, his life is held in position by the claims on him of others as the pole is held by the balanced strain of the guy-ropes; but each is also in the position that others depend on him, so that if his strength gave way something in them, too, would collapse as a tent must if the pole gives way. Have you strength of character? Others will depend on that. Have you strength of will? Others, weaker-willed, may lean on you. Have you a strong faith? Many, unsure themselves, will depend on your faith to hold them up. Any man who stands at such a time 'firm on the rock and strong in Thee' must face a grave and sacred responsibility, that of making free and unselfish use of the strength he has for the sake of others less strong. To honour that responsibility, giving of one's strength while fully conscious of one's own weakness, is to open life to an even fuller endowment of the power of God.

Edward Whymper, in *Scrambles amongst the Alps*, describes how in a certain Alpine village there lived a hunch-back cripple, little Luc. He had seen the climbers start for the mountain tops, and heard them enthuse over their experiences, but the mountains were not for him. Then, one day, a party of climbers resolved to try to carry little Luc up one of the mountains, a stupendous effort. But one by one, in turns, they carried him, each lending all his strength and skill to the little cripple, and at last the mountain top was reached. The strange thing was that each and all agreed that the view was more wonderful than it had ever been before. To spend one's strength, whatever kind of strength it be, freely and unselfishly in a world where so many are weak and handicapped and crippled in hope, and faith, and sense of purpose, is to find a new vision of His purpose, which each may serve with the best of the strength he has. That is, truly, to hold strength sacred.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Inheritance of the Saints.

BY THE VERY REVEREND J. S. MACARTHUR, D.D., THE COLLEGE, MILLPORT.

'Giving thanks unto the Father, who made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.'—Col 1^{12}.

Sometimes when we let our minds go back to the past, to some group to which we belonged in our youth such as a school or college class we begin to think of what has happened to our contemporaries during the intervening years. Some of them we still know, some we have completely lost sight of, a few have become well known. These last seem to have done a great deal more with their lives than we have done. There was a time when we lived the same life as they did, shared the same pursuits, played the same games, had much the same triumphs and disappointments as they had. But now their names are in the newspapers, and ours are not. They have done great things, memorable things, while the circle that knows us is no larger than it was then.

We may admire those old friends that have got on so well, but at times we envy them a little. They had opportunities and gifts that we had not. Something happened just at the right time to set them on the road to success, and we had no such luck. Or perhaps our conscience becomes a little uneasy as we think of the missed opportunities, the unused gifts, the carelessness, and the sloth that has eaten into and blighted so much of our lives. Altogether this delving into the past can be a depressing business.

Do we ever feel like that when we think of the saints? These are the men and women who have done great things for God, who have been the choice vessels of His grace, and the lights of the world in their several generations. As we read of their heroism and devotion we feel that our own lives have nothing like that to show. Had the saints some natural gift of piety that has been denied to us? Was there in them something that made it easy for them to be good where for us it is hard? Or did they have opportunities that never come to us? Had we lived in those early days, could we have followed our Lord about Palestine as His first disciples did, could we have listened to the preaching of His apostles, how we should have responded to such opportunities! In that heroic setting we could have done great things.

But if we think of the difference between the saints and ourselves as mainly one of opportunity and circumstance there will be little expectation behind our prayer that we may follow them in all virtuous and godly living. And Christianity is the religion of example. We have the one supreme example of our Lord Himself. He was God incarnate, and yet His apostle can say, 'Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.' Nothing less must be our aim, but when we are discouraged at the impossibility of such an attainment we find in the lives of the saints examples, more accessible to our weakness and adapted to all circumstances and conditions, of men and women, who did have that mind in them which was also in Christ Jesus.

Paganism has nothing like this to show. There were indeed pagan myths of gods who appeared on earth in the form of men or even of animals, but the great gods of paganism only came down among men to play tricks on them and to share their vices. Then there were semi-divine heroes who corresponded roughly to the saints of Christendom, but with what differences! They were mostly killers of monsters or had some great exploits to their credit or discredit. Scarcely ever was there the idea that they might provide examples of virtue or patterns of a life lived for God.

But with the saints—how great a succour cannot we find in the consideration of those human lives sanctified by piety, love, devotion, purity, martyrdom! And they do not live in a remote world of mythology that owes whatever reality it possesses to the imagination of poets. With them we have a true solidarity, a real fellowship in the communion of saints.

Theologians have had long discussions about this article of the Creed, and much learned talk has been expended on the question whether the Latin word translated *saints* really means holy persons or holy things, whether the original belief was not rather in the fellowship of the sacraments than fellowship with the saints.

In the end there is perhaps not so much difference. Our fellowship with the saints is grounded in our participation with them in the same inheritance, the same holy things—Church, Gospel, Sacraments. This is the inheritance of which God has made us meet to be partakers. And however we think of the communion of saints we must not regard it as only a promise for the future, but as a present reality, as much a present and living reality as the Holy Catholic Church or the forgiveness of sins.

O blest communion, fellowship divine!
We feebly struggle, they in glory shine;
Yet all are one in Thee, for all are Thine.

So one of our best-known hymns puts it. It thinks of the saints in light as those who have passed beyond the veil, passed even beyond the paradise of rest and preparation into the heavenly city that has no need of any sun, but is lightened by the glory of God.

All this is certainly part of the inheritance of which the Father has made us meet to be partakers, but St. Paul meant more than this. He does not wait until his friends are dead before calling them saints. There are saints in Cæsar's household, and Cæsar was Nero. He sends the salutation of the saints to the members of the Corinthian Church of whom he speaks, in spite of all their faults, as called to be saints. These saints are already enlightened, already in the light of the gospel.

That is the glorious inheritance for which the Father has made them meet. The knowledge of the love of Christ, the redemption that He has wrought by His blood, the power of His resurrection, the gift of the Holy Ghost, the Sacraments by which the power of His endless life strengthens us, the holy fellowship of the Church which is His Body, the life eternal here and now—this is the inheritance of the saints in light. To earn the right to such an inheritance is utterly beyond the power of any of us. In that sense not one of us is worthy of it.

How are we to walk worthy of so high a calling? Less by taking thought of our own unworthiness, though that cannot be ignored, than by constant thanksgiving to God for what He has done and is doing for us. So in our commemoration of the saints let us give thanks to God not only for the example they have set us, not only for the inspiration they give us, not only for the hope of reunion with them, but for the glorious inheritance that we share with them, the inheritance that makes us one with them, no matter how diverse in time, circumstance, or spiritual achievement, but still one in the undivided Body of Christ Jesus Himself.

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Remembrance Day—A Challenge to Post-War Mentality.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU, DUNBARTONSHIRE.

'Ye that have escaped the sword, go away, stand not still: remember the Lord afar off, and let Jerusalem come into your mind.'—Jer 51^{50}.

The Day of Remembrance, as it comes round year after year, is a day of deep solemnities and inspiring memories for each one of us. It should also be a time of heart-searchings and high resolves. We feel ourselves to be—let us frankly confess it—a frustrated and somewhat apprehensive people; yet there are elements of hope, too, in this grave crisis in human history which bid us lift up our hearts.

There is some soul of goodness in things evil,
Would men observingly distil it out.

These words of Jeremiah refer to a situation vastly different from our own, and actually have a widely different meaning, yet, if we regard them as words which might have been written for us to-day and look at them in the Divine light, they may guide us and others into the way of a nobler peace—that peace for which our poor shattered

world is yearning. We are beginning at least to be aware of our deeper needs. Multitudes who ignore God and His commands are thinking hard. Thoughtful people are becoming conscious that God's design is a challenge to man's disorder and man's disaster. Just because we live in a desperately needy and bewildered world, it is a fitting time to re-examine and take stock of our moral and spiritual health as a nation and as individuals. Let us look at some of these short, crisp commands as coming from God Himself and let us apply them to our own condition.

To begin with, let us view ourselves as survivors of two world wars and *recall the sacrifice* of those who made it possible for us to survive. '*You who have escaped the sword.*' Were we really worth all the strain and struggle and pain ? For it was by the precious blood of the flower of our race that we were delivered and kept free men in a land inviolate. We dare not take for granted the unimaginable horrors which were endured, the nightmare sufferings and durance vile which were borne by those who defended our land from total destruction. When our vision is pure and our consciences alive we are stabbed awake out of our ignoble slumbers and self-complacency. J. R. Lowell expressed our feelings long ago in his noble Ode of Commemoration, as we think of the fallen :

We find in our dull road their shining track ;
In every nobler mood
We feel the orient of their spirit glow,
Part of our life's unalterable good,
Of all our saintlier aspiration.

We who have escaped the edge of the sword cannot be escapists when we face up to the debt we can never repay.

Further, this indebtedness takes a very concrete form. It is made real and palpable to us as a task which beckons relentlessly, and the word for us here is—*Stand not still*—a clear call that cannot be denied. We dare not stand still and do nothing. And what better tribute could we pay to the abiding memory of those who gave up everything —even life itself—than to revive in a Christian sense the moral and spiritual health of our land. Many will be constrained to say :

And so I pray for strength to bind my soul
With faith unconquerable and hope divine ;
And from the grief and sorrow that are mine
Draw cleansing grace to make my being whole.
Thus from your loss one friend at least shall gain
New life, to prove you have not died in vain.

This is the tenderly coercive power of sacrifice which can create in all our hearts a new determination to be worthy of those who died that we might live.

To ' stand still ' is to invite disaster. We have few, if any, illusions left. That is certainly salutary for us. That will keep us from being lulled into a perilous sleep. May not our besetting danger to-day be that we may be so disgruntled and so empty of a dominating, controlling purpose that any evil spirit may enter in and the end thereof be much worse than the beginning ?

The task loudly calls for the courage of faith, that faith which has been illustrated so nobly in the annals of our land. We recall to-day the spirit which rose triumphant over all apparent defeat and disaster at Dunkirk. We remember the Battle of Britain, and remind ourselves that the Battle *for* Britain demands that the self-same spirit which refused to acknowledge defeat be re-born and re-incarnated in the body politic and in the hearts of every citizen.

But where shall we lay hold of this power and this inspiration ? In the midst of all discouragements that assail his people Jeremiah exclaims, ' Remember the Lord yonder.' He knew that the bare remembrance of God always brought to Israel a steadying and a fortifying power. So did the Psalmist who said, ' I will remember the years of the right hand of the most High.' The truth that must be burned into the national conscience is that we cannot win through our colossal difficulties by living upon the heritage of the past. If we continue to do that we shall sooner or later become spiritual bankrupts. Let us see with our own eyes that a civilization cutting itself loose from its roots in Christian faith must inevitably dwindle and decay. It is only a religious faith that will permanently maintain the Christian standard in any living way. It is high time that we were awake to recognize that goodness in character and conduct is a flower whose roots strike deep into the mysterious heart of things, and that if we persist in disregarding the roots, the flowers will one day wither and die, while no new buds will bloom to take their places. It is only as we unite our lesser wills to the mighty will of God that we shall win through.

In *The Republic* Plato tells of the crew of a ship who decided that their pilot was mad because they noticed that he took observations of the stars. They argued, as practical men will, that a ship sails on the sea and is influenced by the winds and tides and currents and that star-gazing was a foolish and unpractical affair. They therefore confined the pilot to the hold and sailed on—on to shipwreck. These sailors did not realize the necessity in navigation of a fixed point beyond the relativities of wind and waves without which a true course cannot be set.

Which things are, of course, a parable—a parable which has an urgent message for our own day. We may be at sea about many things in these tempestuous times, but we are certainly not without a fixed star as a guide to us as we encounter the storm. Here in this welter of conflicting claims and confused and confusing ideas and of warring consciences God strikes a silence through us all and says, ' This is the way : walk ye in it.' In God's revealed Will we have an absolute standard and a stay and anchor by which we shall ride out any storm. In days gone by we failed and deserved to fail because like Plato's sailors we refused to look beyond earth ; we tried to find our standards and principles somewhere amid the tides and winds of human life, but if we will only look up to God we shall find in His Will of righteousness that unity of spirit and that bond of peace for which the whole world is longing. Then we

shall be raised above all narrow and selfish interests, for we shall view everything in the light of His Kingdom and His commands.

Lastly, notice *the instrument which God chooses* for carrying out His vast designs. 'Let Jerusalem come into your mind,' or, as Moffatt renders it, 'Bethink you of Jerusalem.' In speaking these words Jeremiah knew that he was arousing his people to fresh hope and effort; and he was addressing himself not to ecclesiastical rulers but to ordinary people.

Still to-day does God call upon His Church to carry out His Will. Still does He rally ordinary people to witness as citizens of the great wide commonwealth of Christ. One of the cheering things about our present Church life is just the widespread feeling that somehow Christians must get together. So also is the desire that means must be provided whereby the spiritual and social convictions of ordinary people can be made operative towards the formulating of a Christian international relationship. It is beginning to dawn upon us that there are multitudes of other common people like ourselves who are ready to buy up the opportunity because the days are evil. Professor John Macmurray says, 'In a revolutionary situation a creative religion is necessarily a revolutionary religion.' Yes, the task of recreating the inner unity of Christendom in this critical hour of human history is the function of the Christian Church. Again and again has God saved the world from itself by a reanimated Church. More than a hundred years ago John Keble appealed to his day in words that might have been written for us:

Voice of the fearless saint!
Ring like a trump where gentle hearts
Beat high for Truth, but, doubting, cower and faint:
Tell them the hour is come and they must take their parts.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Mesopotamian Archæology. Professor A. Parrot has written a fascinating account of the history of Mesopotamian archæology,[1] from its first beginnings right up to date. He does not attempt to deal with the content of the texts that have been brought to light, or to evaluate the light they have shed on the history and culture of the ancient world. To do that would have required not a single volume, but many. What is here given is an account of explorations and excavations in the whole area of Mesopotamia, including the Kirkuk and Mari expeditions, often illuminated by the inner history of the expeditions, and the national rivalries that played their part in the story. Some account of the earlier part of the story may be found in other books, but there is no single handbook which combines this with the later story of the inter-war years, and Professor Parrot's book may be warmly commended to all who would realize how our knowledge of the ancient East—so important for the understanding of the Old Testament—has grown out of all recognition during the past century. Of this development Professor Parrot is not merely the historian. In the Mari excavations, whose story is told in his final chapter, he himself played a part as the leader of the mission.

The book is excellently illustrated with pictures of the more important works of art brought to light, as well as with charts and plans of sites and buildings excavated. Moreover, each chapter is furnished with a bibliography that will at once remind the reader of the vast amount of research that has gone into the making of this volume, and direct him to the relevant sources for any part of the story on which he may want fuller information. It is to be regretted that though the work was not completed until September 1946, British and American journals of the war years were still not available in Paris, and the author was forced to rely at one point on indirect sources of information. The publishers will render a great service to scholars everywhere if they will publish comparable volumes in the same series, dealing with Palestinian and Syrian archæology, and with Egyptian archæology.

[1] *Archéologie mesopotamienne* [1946]. Michel, Paris; Fr. 480.

Early Christian Confessions of Faith. In a small but valuable book Professor Cullmann studies the confessions of faith reflected in the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers, and therefore long preceding the Apostles' Creed in its present form.[2] He considers the occasions when some formula of the faith would be required, namely, baptism, the recital of the liturgy, exorcisms, the confessions of the martyrs, and the polemic against heretics, and finds in the New Testament various brief symbols used on some of these occasions. Some of these are unipartite, expressing faith in Christ alone, while some are bipartite, expressing faith in Christ and in God. Tripartite confessions first appear later in the Church. Nevertheless, the writer argues, the fuller confessions in two or three articles only brought out what was already implicit in the confessions in a single article, while confessions in one article and in two both go back to the beginnings of the Church, and neither can claim a greater antiquity than the other. The confessions were always Christo-centric, and though sometimes God the Father stood in the

[2] *Les premières confessions de foi chrétiennes* [1943]. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris; Fr. 18.

first article, doubtless because of the Father-Son relationship, it was always the God who stood revealed in Christ who was confessed.

Christian Problems. The French Jesuit writer H. Rondet has published a short collection of essays on a variety of questions under the title *Problems for Christian Thought*.[1] The subjects dealt with are original sin, the mystic union of the believer with Christ, the Future Life, Hell, Mortal Sin, the Church as the Mystic Body of Christ, and the Sacramental Character of the Mass. Two of the chapters are in the form of a dialogue between an inquirer and his instructor, in which the latter not seldom falls back on dogma to elude the questionings of the modern mind. They contain some penetrating observations, such as the remark that 'the modern man no longer understands the dogma of hell because he no longer believes in sin,' yet on the whole they seem to the reviewer less cogent than they might be. They do not appear to bring out sufficiently profoundly the complexity of the problem of hell, or the irrationality of the sentimental idea that those who will have nothing to do with the fellowship or the will of God will find themselves in heaven. The other chapters are in essay form, and they contain some good things, though all in popular form. The first essay shows how a deeper note is coming into modern philosophy, so that the doctrine of original sin has a closer affinity with the thought of the secular thinker to-day than it had with that of his predecessor of yesterday. The second examines the psychological and theological implications of Gal 2^{20}, while the third traces the development of thought on the After-life in the Bible and in Egyptian and Greek thought. Here there is no overpressing of the Old Testament teaching, and no glimpse of the After-life is found in Job 19^{25-27}, where many writers have found it.

The most unsatisfactory essay to the reviewer is that on the Church as the Body of Christ. Here the saying *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* is quoted with approval, and it is unequivocally stated that this means the Roman church. All other varieties of Christians are excluded from the Body of Christ, along with Jews, pagans, and atheists. It is admitted that there are Protestant and Orthodox Christians, who enjoy the spirit of the Church, but this is held to be analogous to the heat of the sun, which continues to be felt for a time after the sun itself has gone below the horizon, and in the very birth of all other communions than the Roman there is said to be the taint of original sin. While the author speaks in terms of esteem for many who are outside the Roman church, his dogmatic arrogance denies them any part in the Body of Christ. That this is not new does not make it the less regrettable or foolish. The experience of salvation in Christ is not confined to the Roman church, and the grace of the Saviour is not subject to the control of men. Of that grace He has owned as a part of His body many communions other than the Roman; for He is still the Head and Lord of the Church, who renounces His throne to no man.

[1] *Problèmes pour la réflexion chrétienne* [1945]. Éditions Spes, Paris; Fr. 100.

The Resurrection of the Body. The Swedish scholar C. M. Edsman has carried through a good deal of research into the history of the belief in the resurrection of the body. He has published two articles in Swedish on the reply to a counter-argument against the belief,[2] which pointed out that the body might be devoured by living creatures, burnt, drowned, or turned to dust and blown away, so that its restoration would be incredible. In these articles Edsman traced the reply to this argument through the Latin and the Greek Fathers, and in a later article he proposes to examine Iranian replies to the same problems.

The same writer has now published also a most learned discussion in English on *The Body and Eternal Life*.[3] Here he begins with a passage by Jacob of Serugh, quoted in an unpublished MS. of a work by John of Dara, which he compares with Bedjan's published edition of Jacob's quoted work. The passage is found to rest on an interpretation of Is $66^{7f.}$, which has few parallels in the history of interpretation. The author therefore turns to a minute examination of the text of the Isaianic passage, in the light of the ancient versions, and to this he devotes a large part of his study. The chief ideas in the passage from Jacob of Serugh, to which attention is devoted, are the thought that even if the bones of the dead be scattered through all the world, yet they can be brought together by God in the twinkling of an eye, since the world lies in the hollow of His hand. Just as many pearls may rest on a hand, and then be brought swiftly together by a single movement, so may this wonder be wrought. Edsman not alone studies Jacob of Serugh's use of these figures, but gathers together parallel ideas from other writers.

In the shorter second part of his study, he deals with the metaphors of the Potter, the Statue, and the Casket in relation to the Resurrection, in the thought of Hellenized Judaism and early Eastern Christianity. These metaphors were used to reinforce the argument for the resurrection of the body, and it was argued that if God could create the world from nothing, and the human body from almost nothing, surely He could revivify the corpse. Corresponding images from Indian and Greek-Oriental Mystery Religions, and their ritual background, form the subject of a short section, while the final section treats of the relations between Christian and later Iranian use of the casket simile. Altogether the work, though occupying but 72 pages, is a monument of the widest learning.

The Prophet in the Old Testament and in Islam. In a short study on the prophet in the Old Testa-

[2] 'Uppståndelsetron: ett motargument och dess historia,' in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*, ix. [1944] 69–102, and xi. [1946] 5–46.

[3] *Horae Soederblomianae*: I. Mélanges Joh. Pedersen, Fasc. II. [1946]. S. K. D. Bokförlag, Stockholm.

ment and in Islam,[1] Professor W. Zimmerli examines first the way in which the Old Testament prophets and Muhammad envisaged their function. Alike they regarded themselves as charged with the message of God to their contemporaries. Those elements in Old Testament prophecy which have received much emphasis in modern works, namely, the abnormal or ecstatic elements, are next reviewed, but are held to be incidental rather than central. The real criterion of prophecy was the sense of Divine constraint. This is found to have marked Muhammad as clearly as it marked the Old Testament prophets, and he is accordingly held to have been truly a prophet. But 1 K 22 shows that a man could have the sense of the Divine constraint and yet be a false prophet. Hence the difference between true prophets and false prophets calls for examination. It is found to lie in the content of the message, rather than in the constraint of its reception, or the forms of its delivery. The essence of the message of the Old Testament prophets is held to be the demand for obedience to the will of God, and a faith which consists in the yielding of life to that obedience. While Muhammad, too, demanded faith, it was fundamentally an acceptance of his own teaching. Further, Professor Zimmerli notes that power brought a corrupting touch to the prophetic quality of Muhammad, so that he ceased to be as truly a prophet as he had been. The whole essay is worthy of careful study. It rests on sound scholarship, and offers a discriminating appreciation of both Old Testament prophets and Muhammad.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

[1] *Le prophète dans l'Ancien Testament et dans l'Islam* [1945]. La Mission de Bâle, Lausanne; Fr. 1.25.

Contributions and Comments.

Lists of Papyri and Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament.

The Rev. Edwin Brady in the May [1947] number of The Expository Times raises points which call forth some further suggestions *re* the New Testament Papyri and MSS.

The 1933 revision of Lake's *Text of the New Testament* by S. New is as vague as its predecessors regarding Papyri, but a considerable amount of detail is set forth in more recent works by Sir F. G. Kenyon (*Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible* [1933], *The Text of the Greek Bible* [1937], *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*[4] [1939]), where one feels that other items are much overshadowed, perhaps with justice, by the representatives of the Chester Beatty Collection; and in the sketch of Leo Vaganay—Eng. tr., *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Sands, London; 1937).

One can appreciate the need for a list of Papyri, Ostraca, and the like, but completeness is not easy even in referring to uncial and minuscule MSS. C. R. Gregory's standard list, *Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig, 1908), is now close on forty years old and both it and his supplementary works are practically unprocurable and not easy of access (*e.g.*, they are not in Aberdeen or St. Andrews University Libraries). The same holds good in a measure of von Dobschütz's Appendices in *ZNTW*. While these works are still accurate as regards content, etc., of MSS., they are in many cases not so on details as to locus, etc. (to mention two outstanding examples: ℵ is now in the British Museum and the famous 565 is stated by Gregory to be at 'Petersburg,' though it now appears to have found sanctuary in Paris).

Has the time not come for the preparation of a revised edition of Gregory in which the detail sought by Mr. Brady could be set down together with the similar information, duly revised, which is required for all sections of the manuscript witness?

The evidence produced by Milne and Skeat in *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* to the effect that this MS. did not always contain Jn 21^{25} and that of Skeat in *ZNTW* xxxvii. [1938], 211–215 regarding its reading at Mt 6^{28} seems to indicate that the great groundwork of Tischendorf and his contemporaries requires detailed revision before being accepted as the basis for a modern text. It would appear that the methods outlined by R. B. Haselden in *Scientific Aids for the Study of Manuscripts* (Supplement to the Transactions of the Bibliographical Society No. 10 [1935]) have been only very spasmodically applied to Biblical MSS.

The decision of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to publish a new Translation of the Bible is a welcome one, but it comes at a time when the spadework preparation for such a venture, which was done for Father Knox by Wordsworth and White and their successors, still remains to be carried out and to be published before the great discoveries of the past thirty years in the Greek New Testament field are properly recorded. Should the proposal not await the revision and completion of the new Oxford Greek Testament?

Ian A. Moir.

Stanley, Perth.

Lead us not into temptation.

I have read with interest the Rev. G. B. Verity's note on 'Lead us not into temptation.' But I cannot agree with his view that we cannot ask

God to refrain from doing something. We may be quite as truly seeking to get our wills into line with His when we ask Him to refrain from doing something as when we ask Him to do something. Both petitions are subject to His will. Incidentally in Matins and Evensong we daily make the petition 'Take not thy Holy Spirit from us!' Although our Lord's own petition, 'Let this cup depart from me,' is not couched in an absolutely negative form yet the meaning amounts to 'lead Me not into the temptation of this cup, but nevertheless not My will but Thine be done.'

Mr. Verity, referring to the idiom by which 'when one of two contrasted statements is intended to qualify the other, it is sometimes forcibly expressed as an actual denial,' suggests that 'lead us not into temptation' is used here as qualifying 'but deliver us from evil.' This seems a possible interpretation. But I suggest another which has always seemed the most natural and helpful to myself—I join the request with the preceding petition 'Forgive us our sins' as well as with the last, making all three one petition, and paraphrase it, 'Forgive us our sins, not leading us into temptation but delivering us from the evil.' There is a spiritual law by which the result of sin is further temptation to a soul already weakened by the previous fall, and inasmuch as God is the source of this spiritual law, it is He who indirectly leads us into the further temptation which is the result of the first sin. Pharaoh hardened his heart and then, we are told, God hardened Pharaoh's heart. Our Lord bade the disciples 'pray that ye enter not into temptation.' They sinned by sleeping instead of praying and were led (Peter in particular) into the temptation to disloyalty.

C. L. RICHARDS.

Pimperne Rectory,
Blandford, Dorset.

'Lead us not into temptation but . . .'

I FIND the suggestion of the Rev. G. B. Verity regarding these words interesting, but hardly convincing. There is another suggestion which appeals to me, and I should be thankful to learn how it is regarded by others. There is the Hebrew phrase נתן בְּיַד 'give into the hand of,' 'into the power of,' 'deliver over to.' Why may not the words, 'Lead us not into temptation' represent some such Hebrew or Aramaic words meaning, 'Lead us not,' or, 'Bring us not,' or, 'Let us not fall,' into the hand (the power) of temptation? This is the negative form of the latter part of the petition, which is positive, 'Deliver us from evil'; and it is this that we seem to require in the former part. This suggestion appears in *The Son of Man* by E. A. Abbott (Cambridge University Press, 1910; see p. 657 f.). W. POWELL.

West Haddon.

When did Jesus Foresee the Crucifixion?

IN your issue for July, 1946, Dr. Roderick Dunkerley, quoting Dr. C. J. Cadoux, rightly insists that greater attention ought to be paid to our Lord's 'upbraiding' of the Cities of the Lake and His Lament over Jerusalem. Sometimes, however, it seems to be deduced that it was not till late in His ministry that Jesus saw that He would be crucified. Is this so? If He had gathered a large number of *true* disciples, would not Pilate still have thought that he had good reasons for putting Him to death? Or would the Priests have thought it any less 'expedient that one man should die for the people' lest 'the Romans should come and take away our place and nation?' Might not the Pharisees too have joined in the hunt? Would any of these have believed that there was no danger of a popular up-rising? Is it not possible that, in His early ministry, Jesus *both* hoped to win a large following among 'the people' *and* foresaw that He was to be the Suffering Servant? Surely at thirty He could already read 'the signs of the times.' C. RYDER SMITH.

St. Albans, Herts.

Biblical Sacramental Theory.

A SMALL group of devout persons listened respectfully to an exposition of the article by Principal William Robinson on 'Biblical Sacramental Theory' from the April EXPOSITORY TIMES. They said they did not find it correspond to their experience. One put it, 'As an elder of the church (Baptist) I serve at the Lord's Table and when my turn comes I offer prayer there. The bread and the wine speak to me of my Lord offering Himself in the breaking of His body and the shedding of His blood for ME. He speaks to me in the service; He comes to me; and I am only a simple soul and cannot follow any distinction or refinement beyond that.'

A lady, in the same vein, said she thought there was a deep underlying unity of this experience between practising Christians of all the churches, and that it was a pity that theologians should introduce difficulties of interpretation where the ordinary believer was content to leave unspoken what was beyond definition. I should add the comment that she is a person of more than average intelligence and depth of faith, and by no means inclined to face life with closed eyes.

The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit, by H. Wheeler Robinson, 186, registers something of this approach.

Two sentences in the article, p. 174, call for question. 'The Sacrament is God's organ for conveying grace. . . .' 'If we think of the Sacrament as the means which *God has ordained* for the conveying of grace. . . .' Ought we not to qualify these statements to make them read that 'the Sacrament is one of God's organs' and 'the Sacrament is one of the means'?

There is a prior question behind Principal

Robinson's article, namely, what is grace? It is too big for me to touch on in detail here. I suspect that our view of grace, whether it tends to think of grace 'as a medicine which works almost willy-nilly' or 'a loving relationship of God with the human soul working out pre-eminently in the development of spiritual and moral character' is always read back into our doctrine and practice of the Sacraments and makes their meaning for us.

I offer these comments as a working minister who feels there is value in testing learned theses against the spiritual experience of men and women of proven Christian faith and character, and who make the solid core of our churches.

C. SIDNEY HALL.

Swindon.

Note on Romans iii. 8b.

ὧν τὸ κρίμα ἔνδικόν ἐστι.

No commentator, ancient or modern, seems to have considered the possibility that the genitive ὧν may be subjective, 'Whose verdict is just'; yet, if these words were found in a secular writer, I venture to think that they would naturally convey that meaning and no other. Moreover, this interpretation seems to me to suit the context, and to be in line with the general use of the words *κρίμα* and *ἔνδικος*.

As universally interpreted, St. Paul in this sentence dismisses his critics as unworthy of serious argument: so Sanday and Headlam, 'St. Paul does not argue the point, or say anything further about the calumny directed against himself; he contents himself with brushing away an excuse which is obviously unreal.'

But St. Paul does not elsewhere treat those who disagreed with him in this way; in 1 Co 11^6 the appeal to custom is preceded by fourteen verses of reasoned argument, and the terrible gibe of Gal 5^{12} follows lengthy discussions, which employ the dialectic recognized by his opponents. Moreover, it is not to be assumed that this disagreement with St. Paul was the fruit of mere jealousy or faction. We can tell from this Epistle and that to the Galatians what the teaching that those whom he quotes mistrusted is likely to have been; indeed, the preceding verses summarize it. The unbelief of the Old Israel in particular (*v.*[3]) and all our sins and falsehoods in general (*vv.*[4. 5. 6]) only call out the mercy and redeeming power of God. Hearing this, men of good will, alarmed for the sanctity of the moral standard, might very well say, If this is so, the more sin, the more grace (cf. $6^{1. 15}$). This is what St. Paul's teaching might very well seem to lead to by men animated by no captious spirit.

To brush these fears aside is not like that which we know elsewhere of St. Paul. It is at least equally likely that he conceded the conclusion that they drew from their premises; their *κρίμα*, decision or verdict, is *ἔνδικον*, a just conclusion; 'if I really taught that we should do evil that the good of God's mercy should be poured upon us, I should be rightly condemned'; and in ch. 6^{1-14} he explains that this is not at all what he meant. But, as so often, he follows another line of thought first, the hopelessness of man's unaided efforts, whether with or without the Law, and the salvation of all through faith. Then in ch. 6 he takes up again his former point, and shows that antinomianism does not follow from his teaching.

As regards the words, *ἔνδικος* does not occur in LXX, and only once besides in the New Testament, He 2^2, which throws no light on this passage. The classical use of the word appears to be predominantly forensic, and if anything supports the interpretation of a decision given according to the evidence rather than according to the facts.

The word *κρίμα* in classical usage is colourless; it is used of a forensic judgment, or of a verdict on a literary work; but the only instances cited by Liddell and Scott of the sense of condemnation are from LXX and the New Testament.

The word occurs 235 times in the Septuagint, nearly always as a translation of מִשְׁפָּט. This is likewise colourless; the 'Judgment' is often a vindication and not a condemnation. Of these 235 occurrences, 92 are with the genitive, and in an immense majority of these cases the genitive is *θέου* or *κυρίου* or *μου* or *σου* referring to God. With these may be classed *κ. τοῦ στόματος αὐτῦν* (4 times) and *κ. τῆς δικαιοσύνης σου* (5 times). The genitive thus applies to the giver of the verdict, but this cannot be decisive for this text, as the application to a human verdict is obviously a different thing.

The genitive of the object of the verdict is fairly common, but as noted above it is not possible to press the sense of condemnation. For example, *κ. πενῆτος* Ex 23^6, *τὸ κ. τοῦ παιδαρίου* Jg 13^{12} with the meaning of 'manner of life,' cf. *κατὰ τὸ κ. τῶν ἐθνων* 4 K 18^{33}.

But the genitive is found of the subject other than God, for example, 1 Es 9^4 *κατὰ τὸ κ. τῶν προκαθημένων πρεσβυτέρων*, Sir 41^2, *καλόν σου* (sc. *θανάτου*) *τὸ κ. ἐστι.* The former is exactly the meaning that I have placed upon the genitive ὧν in the text.

In the New Testament, the word often bears the meaning of condemnation; especially Mk 12^{40} and parallels, 2 P 2^3 and Rev 17^1. On the other hand, in the Epistle to the Romans itself, 5^{16}, the word *κρίμα* is supplemented by *κατάκριμα*.

It appears then that while classical usage supports my view, that of the New Testament and LXX is on the whole against it; but this need not be conclusive since my contention is that St. Paul is here using a theological term in a non-theological sense: just as we may say, 'It has merit,' 'You are justified,' without reference to the theological meaning of these terms.

Commentators and expositors have naturally taken so common a word as *κρίμα* in its theological sense; the same process has confused the interpretation of Dn 9^{27}, where many commentators have been unable to take בְּרִית in the sense of a treaty made by men one with another. For this reason the view I have put forward seems to me to deserve consideration.

W. O. FITCH.

Oxford.

Entre Nous.

A Suppressed Broadcast.

Miss Dorothy Sayers, who is best known by her series of delightful thrillers, has published a book, *Unpopular Opinions* (Gollancz; 8s. 6d. net), which she thinks is bound to annoy all kinds of people. Indeed, three of the 'papers' printed here were so unpopular with the persons who commissioned them that they were suppressed before they appeared. Of course one turns at once to the suppressed broadcasts to find out what outraged the authorities concerned. It may interest our readers to hear an account of the first of these 'rejected addresses.' It is entitled 'Christian Morality,' and it is really an exposition of Christ's view of human duty. 'Setting aside the scandal caused by His Messianic claims and His reputation as a political firebrand, only two accusations of personal depravity seem to have been brought against Jesus of Nazareth,' Miss Sayers writes. 'First, that He was a Sabbath-breaker. Secondly, that He was a gluttonous man and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners—or (to draw aside the veil of Elizabethan English which makes it all sound so much more respectable) that He ate too heartily, drank too freely, and kept very disreputable company, including grafters of the lowest type, and ladies who were no better than they should be.'

For nineteen and a half centuries the Christian churches have laboured, not without success, to remove this unfortunate impression made by their Lord and Master. They have hustled the Magdalens from the Communion Table, founded Total Abstinence Societies in the name of Him who made the water wine, and added improvements of their own, such as various bans and anathemas upon dancing and theatre-going. They have transferred the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday, and, feeling that the original Commandment 'Thou shalt not work' was rather half-hearted, have added to it a new Commandment, 'Thou shalt not play.'

Whether these things are, or are not, in the spirit of Christ, it is certain, Miss Sayers thinks, that there are a great many people now living in the world who firmly believe that 'Christian Morals,' as distinct from purely secular morality, consist in three things and three things only: Sunday observance, not getting intoxicated, and not practising—well, in fact, not practising 'immorality.'

But, if we look at the Gospels with the firm intention to discover the *emphasis* of Christ's morality we shall find that it lay along different lines. Disreputable people who knew they were disreputable were gently told to 'go and sin no more'; the really unparliamentary language was reserved for those thrifty, respectable and Sabbatarian citizens who enjoyed the approval of the authorities and their own. And the one and only thing that ever seems to have roused the 'meek and mild' Son of God to a display of outright physical violence was the assumption that 'business is business.' The money-changers in Jerusalem drove a very thriving trade, and made as shrewd a profit as any other set of brokers who traffic in foreign exchanges; but the only use Christ had for these financiers was to throw their property down the front steps of the Temple. Perhaps, adds Miss Sayers, if the churches had had the courage to lay their emphasis where Christ laid it, we might not have come to this present frame of mind in which it is assumed that the value of all work, and the value of all people, is to be assessed in terms of economics.

It is only fair to admit, as Miss Sayers does, that the churches are at last waking up. The best Christian minds are striving to readjust the emphasis, and put it where it should be. We cannot really attain a Christian status in society until we get rid of the idea that acquisitiveness is a virtue and that the value of anything is represented in terms of profit and cost.

Not a very terrible blast this broadcast, surely? Rather a fresh wind of sense and true Christianity.

F. J. Rae.

Our Defence Mechanism.

'What do you make of all this? Is there indeed anything you value more than life? What do you believe? Is your faith a comfort to you under the present circumstances? . . .

'In ordinary times we get along surprisingly well, on the whole, without ever discovering what our faith really is. If, now and again, this remote and academic problem is so unmannerly as to thrust its way into our minds, there are plenty of things we can do to drive the intruder away. We can get the car out, or go to a party or the cinema, or read a detective story, or have a row with the district council, or write a letter to the papers about the habits of the night-jar, or Shakespeare's use of nautical metaphor. Then we build up a defence mechanism against self-questioning, because, to tell the truth, we are very much afraid of ourselves.' [1]

Aspiration.

'Personally I come nearest to a mystical experience by way of aspiration. Religious aspiration

[1] Dorothy Sayers, *Unpopular Opinions*.

has a moral background. I ardently desire to be a better man. I picture the ideal of what a man just in my position should be. I actively and intensely desire to rise towards that ideal, and I look up for help. *Sursum corda*—" Lift up your hearts " ; in a pattern of worship dating from about A.D. 200 the bishop is given these words to say, and the congregation replies, " We lift them up unto the Lord." The Lord responds, and to some extent I am conscious of His response in an inward cleansing, strengthening, renewal. The human spirit has received in-breathing—inspiration—from the Divine Spirit.' [1]

Religious Poetry of the Seventeenth Century.

Vaughan, Quarles, Crashaw, John Davies, Henry More, and Traherne are not popular poets, in the accepted sense. Yet somebody is always reading them. And each of them has a circle of devoted admirers.

Anything that tends to enlarge and widen these circles is to be commended. Hence one hails with pleasure *Studies in Religious Poetry of the Seventeenth Century*, by the Rev. W. L. Doughty, B.A., B.D. (Epworth Press ; 7s. 6d. net).

Mr. Doughty writes with a kind of hearty, almost boisterous, gusto. He gives the impression that he writes because he likes to write, and is enjoying himself. Moreover, he has knowledge. And he can throw at one an arresting phrase or sentence, as when he begins his essay on Traherne, ' Thomas Traherne is a standing refutation of Swinburne's contention that " dead men rise up never." ' That is as true as it is apt. For Mr. Bertram Dobell's feat of raising a poet, stone dead and utterly forgotten, to a newness of life and even immortality was a wonderful achievement.

So far, so good. But Mr. Doughty begins his Preface by remarking that this is a book of ' personal predilections.' And, as it happens, his are not mine. A little further on he tells us that his concern is ' primarily with subject matter.' But, in the main, what interests him in these poets leaves me cold. While that in them that thrills and fascinates me appears not to appeal to him at all. For instance, is his painstaking study of Quarles likely to wile new readers to him ? One doubts it. There are masses of quotations. Here are the things one wishes that Quarles had not written. And much else ; much of it quite sound, but not superlatively good. But all the passages that pull me back to him are here omitted.

Nowhere in literature is there so vivid a description of the war in the members, the tussle between the higher and the lower in us, as in the seventh chapter of the Romans. But its pre-eminence conceded, what should one rank next to it ? Most people probably would vote for the immortal sentences in Augustine. And who can quarrel with them for so doing ? And yet—for succinctness, for truth, for sheer desperation, does anything beat Quarles ?

> I like, dislike ; lament for what I could not ;
> I do, undo ; yet still do what I should not,
> And, at the selfsame instant, will the thing I would not.

Mr. Doughty does deal for a little with this side of Quarles' mind, but soon slips out on a quotation from Christina Rossetti—a natural and admirable quotation, though not nearly as good as Quarles' own lines.

Or take the chapter on Traherne. To me, he is even bigger as a writer of prose than he is in verse. His ' Centuries of Meditations ' far out-tops the poems. Yet these, too, have much in them that grips and haunts and has the authentic note. But not one of the passages that sweep my soul is here.

Mr. Doughty seems to be most at home with Sir John Davies and Henry More ; to me the least stars in his galaxy of poets. So those whose interests and predilections are the same as Mr. Doughty's will find in his volume treasure trove, and a door opening on a refreshing garden.

But since mine are not his, his book awakens in me something of the feeling with which in wartime we wandered through some picture gallery, from which the real treasures had been removed for safety, leaving staring and irritating gaps upon the walls. A. J. GOSSIP.

Professor Snaith's ' The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament.'

One of the ' Notes ' in the July number dealt with Professor Snaith's *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament.* Unfortunately only the American publishers were given. The book is published in this country by the Epworth Press, 25–35 City Road, London, E.C.1.

St. Paul : Bibliography.

A comprehensive Bibliography of the writings relating to St. Paul is being assembled at the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Illinois, U.S.A., under the direction of Professor C. Umhau Wolf. The project will cover the period from 1830 to date. Any suggestions, information concerning similar projects, notices of rare items, and off-prints will be appreciated by Dr. Wolf.

---

[1] The Bishop of Truro, Dr. J. W. Hunkin, in *The Modern Churchman*, xxxvii. [July, 1947], 134.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

READ AT HOME

for a London University

B.A. or B.D. DEGREE

In your leisure hours you do a certain amount of serious reading. But is this reading haphazard or is it *planned*? Has it a *definite objective*? Why not read with a view to crowning your efforts with a B.A. or B.D. Degree? Quite apart from other (and perhaps more material) advantages, the work of preparation will widen your outlook and keep you abreast with modern studies.
In recent years many Ministers have taken Degrees by reading at home in their leisure hours under the experienced guidance of Wolsey Hall tutors.

Open to all

You need not go into residence or attend any lectures. All that is necessary is to pass three exams., Matriculation (or, if you are over 23, the *shorter* Special Entrance —see below), Intermediate, and Final; you may read for these at home without interfering with your pastoral work.

Special Entrance Examination

Anyone over 23 who intends to read for a London Degree may take the Special Entrance Exam. instead of Matriculation. Only four subjects need be presented, and these may generally be chosen from among those to be taken for the higher exams. Mathematics is not compulsory. Over 1,200 Wolsey Hall Students have passed this examination.

Wolsey Hall Postal Courses

for the above examinations are prepared and individually conducted by a staff of more than 80 University Graduate Tutors. These Courses comprise Lessons, Test Papers, Model Answers, correction of your work and solution of *all* difficulties by your tutors. A Guarantee is given that in case of failure, tuition will be continued *free*.

N.B.—The Course, *as well as the fee*, may be spread over any length of time. Students paying by instalments and wishing to discontinue the Course, *for any reason*, are liable for no outstanding instalments except those due at the time of discontinuance.

● *Write (mentioning examination or Degree) for Prospectus, post free from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 20,*

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

T. & T. CLARK

The following Titles are again available:

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

By Professor WILLISTON WALKER, D.D.
Post 8vo, 600 pages, with maps. **20s.** net.

'A remarkable feat . . . presenting in one volume a conspectus of the whole of Christian history.'
Church Times.

DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE

Edited by Dr. JAMES HASTINGS
In cloth. **32s.** net.

Complete in one Volume. Entirely distinct from the Five-Volume Dictionary—not an abridgment of it. Brings the contents of the Bible within reach of those who have not the means to buy or the knowledge to use the larger work.

A COMPANION TO THE BIBLE

Edited by Professor T. W. MANSON, D.Litt., D.D.
Ready 16th October. **16s.** net.

'Brilliantly written . . . contributed by fifteen Biblical Scholars, it deals in a clear and authoritative manner with most of the problems raised by the study of the Bible during recent years.'
The Times Literary Supplement.

'A great book. . . . There have been in the past many useful "helps" but this will supersede them all.'—*Methodist Recorder.*

AN INTRODUCTORY HEBREW GRAMMAR, with Progressive Exercises in Reading and Writing

By the late Professor A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., revised throughout by Professor J. E. M'FADYEN, D.D.
24th Edition. **12s 6d.** net.

'The best Hebrew Grammar.'—*British Weekly.*

A KEY TO THE EXERCISES IN DAVIDSON'S INTRODUCTORY HEBREW GRAMMAR

By Professor J. E. M'FADYEN, D.D.
12s. 6d. net.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

(International Theological Library)
By the Rev. G. GALLOWAY, D.Phil., D.D.
19s. net.

I AND THOU

By Professor MARTIN BUBER. Translated by R. G. SMITH.
3s. 6d. net.

'A revelation. It is a book to be read through and pondered and then read again.'
The Times Literary Supplement.

38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH

'For a generation which has to face the problems of a world disposed to challenge all authority, and of a Church conscious of its inability to concentrate its forces for its world-wide task, the large outlook of these volumes is valuable beyond all telling.'—*Baptist Times.*

In Thirteen Handsome Volumes

THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS

Edited by Dr. JAMES HASTINGS

Vol. I. A—Art.
„ II. Arthur—Bunyan.
„ III. Burial—Confessions.
„ IV. Confirmation—Drama.
„ V. Dravidians—Fichte.
„ VI. Fiction—Hyksos.
Vol. VII. Hymns—Liberty.
„ VIII. Life—Mulla.
„ IX. Mundas—Phrygians.
„ X. Picts—Sacraments.
„ XI. Sacrifice—Sudra.
„ XII. Suffering—Zwingli.

INDEX VOL.—General Index.
Index of Foreign Words.
Index of Scripture Passages.
List of Authors, with their Contributions.

Price per Volume : In Half Leather - - - 70s. net.
In Cloth - - - - 45s. net.

The problems which at present confront the world cannot be solved by Twentieth-Century wisdom alone. Their roots were planted in the past. They are not new problems. They have confronted the people of former ages and can only be solved by applying the lessons learned by our forefathers.

The wisdom of the ages on all questions—ethical, social, religious, economic and political—is gathered together in this one great work. Here is represented what the great scholars of the world have been able to learn about all the nations as they developed or decayed, and of the nations now going through these processes.

This great work appeals to every man and woman who has any interest in the history of human progress, or in the present moral, spiritual and social well-being of mankind.

While it is the work of more than two hundred specialists, it is popular in form and non-technical in language. It is a library in itself. One eminent authority has said—'It contains in twelve admirably arranged volumes the substance of twelve hundred.'

'Any possessor of the Encyclopædia is armed at all points on every subject with which the theologian is concerned.'—*Christian World.*

'A remarkable achievement . . . the editorial work has been extraordinarily well done.' *Guardian.*

'Has made itself an indispensable place in the apparatus of the student of any part of its wide field.'—*Harvard Theological Review.*

'The more the Encyclopædia is used, the more it is valued.'—*Hibbert Journal.*

'We have been repeatedly astonished and gratified by the completeness of the articles and the skill with which they are presented.'—*Times Literary Supplement.*

38 GEORGE STREET EDINBURGH, 2

T. & T. CLARK

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS NEW YORK

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post. Entered as Second-Class Matter, 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2.
AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4
ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£7, 7s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 8th of the previous month.*

Annual Subscription, including postage, 16s. 6d. net.
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.